

DESK

New Series

Volume VII, Number 26

April 1956

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language

Editors

PETER ALEXANDER
NORMAN DAVIS

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
JUN 14 1956
PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Assistant Editor

JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

Canterbury, Lichfield, and the Vespasian Psalter (*concluded*).

By Kenneth Sisam 113

Langland, Hilton, and the Three Lives. By S. S. Hussey . 132

Sidney and Agrippa. By A. C. Hamilton 151

Sir Walter Scott as Ballad Editor. By William Montgomerie 158

The Art of Fiction in George Eliot's Reviews. By James

D. Rust 164

NOTES

The Green Knight Shoeless Again (Marjory Rigby) . . 173

'Die and Live' (C. T. Onions) 174

Sir Thomas Wilson's Translation of Montemayor's *Diana*

(D. M. Anderson) 176

Shakespeare and Lewkenor (Kenneth Muir) 182

Definitions of Love (Frank Kermode) 183

Two Manuscript Poems of Coleridge (Frederick L. Beaty) . 185

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR WALTER GREG; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; A. W. REED; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.:

Introduction to Old English, by G. L. Brook; Altenglisches Elementarbuch, by M. Lehnert, 188; Pall Mall: Beiträge zur Etymologie und Quantitätstheorie, by H. M. Flasdieck, 189; The Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson, translated by Jean I. Young, 192; The Wycliffe Bible, by Sven L. Fristedt, 194; English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding Drama, by C. S. Lewis, 195; Il Teatro di John Marston, by Giuliano Pellegrini; Barocco Inglese, by Giuliano Pellegrini, 198; Tillotson. A Study in Seventeenth Century Literature, by Louis G. Locke, 199; John Bunyan, by Roger Sharrock, 201; Swift and the Church of Ireland, by Louis A. Landa, 202; The Early Irish Stage, by William Smith Clark, 205; Coleridge, Opium and *Kubla Khan*, by Elisabeth Schneider, 207; Thackeray the Novelist, by Geoffrey Tillotson, 209; The Formation of the Phillipps Library up to the Year 1840, by A. N. L. Munby, 211; Short Notices, 214; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 218; List of Publications Received, 222.

2

CANTERBURY, LICHFIELD, AND THE VESPASIAN PSALTER

(Concluded)

By KENNETH SISAM

IN a previous article¹ I began the examination of Professor Kuhn's claim² that five important Anglo-Saxon manuscripts—the Vespasian Psalter, the Golden Gospels at Stockholm, B.M. Royal I E VI, Tiberius C II, and the Book of Cerne—were produced at Lichfield; and aimed to establish: (I) that the Vespasian Psalter was the book at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, described by Thomas of Elmham early in the fifteenth century; (II) that for England south of the Humber in the eighth and early ninth centuries the study of Ornament cannot supply close dates or localizations; (III) that the content of only one of the five manuscripts offers precise though disputed evidence of a connexion with Lichfield. I go on to examine the evidence adduced from Handwriting and from Language.

IV. *Evidence from Handwriting*

The dating and localization of an Anglo-Saxon manuscript from handwriting are subject to the difficulties that have been mentioned already under Ornament.³ They are less because more examples of script survive. A majority of manuscripts are without notable ornament, and the contents of some of them supply close dates or limiting dates (e.g. any manuscript containing Bede's *History*, or references to it, will be after 730). Again, the many manuscripts that show writing by more than one hand, or in more than one kind of script, offer favourable conditions for comparison. Above all, there are a number of early charters, none of them ornamented, from south of the Humber: these, if they are originals or strictly contemporary copies, supply dated specimens of handwriting.

On the basis of the known fixed and limiting dates, a palaeographer, consciously or unconsciously, constructs a hypothetical scheme of development, and, by comparison fits into this scheme the large proportion of manuscripts that cannot be closely dated from their own contents. Hence dates like 'circa 800', or 'late eighth century', are usually conjectural; and they are relative, not absolute dates. Their accuracy depends on the

¹ *R.E.S.*, N.S. vii (1956), 1-10.

² 'The Vespasian Psalter and the O.E. Charter Hands', *Speculum*, xviii (1943), 458-83; and 'From Canterbury to Lichfield', *Speculum*, xxiii (1948), 591-629. Page references in brackets are to these articles.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 6.

experience and insight of the palaeographer responsible for them. In favourable conditions they are probably within a generation (say twenty-five years) of the true dates. In unfavourable conditions (e.g. where the hands are exceptional, or very stable, or, like uncial, very artificial) the margin of error is nearer fifty years.

For localization by handwriting the margin of error cannot be expressed in miles. Early Anglo-Saxon manuscripts whose place of origin is certain are rare, and uncertainty within wide limits is usual. Canterbury and Lichfield are over 150 miles apart.

Since Dr. Kuhn relies mainly on charters in his sections on handwriting, some considerations on their value as evidence should be noticed. Early Anglo-Saxon charters are not certified as originals by seals, or as original duplicates (*chirographa*) by cutting through letters so that the two parts tally. When experts in diplomatic have passed the contents of a charter as authentic, it may still be a copy made considerably later than the transaction it records. The decision whether it is an original usually depends on how its script fits into the hypothetical scheme of development which the palaeographer has in mind. If he thinks the script suits well enough the date indicated by the contents, he will regard the charter as original or contemporary. Hence there may be differences of opinion about the date of the handwriting in a charter which is an authentic record of a datable transaction.¹ And a slightly later copy will usually pass all tests from handwriting, so that in a standard of reference critically prepared from charters, some of the dates are likely to be a little too early.

For the issue 'Canterbury or Lichfield?', the place where a charter was written² matters more than the exact date of its script. The charters referred to are mostly those of Mercian kings who dominated Kent in the eighth and early ninth centuries. Sweet consulted antiquaries who advised him that royal charters—grants made by or approved by the king—were always written in the king's scriptorium;³ and he accepted that as the rule, though he noted some probable exceptions. Dr. Kuhn accepts it in practice (pp. 475 ff.). Then, as I understand it, his argument runs: The scriptorium of the Mercian kings was at or near Lichfield, their ecclesiastical and political capital; and so the script of Mercian royal charters will be that of Lichfield. By this argument royal charters from the Canterbury and Worcester archives which concern those churches can be used as evidence for the handwriting of Lichfield, which itself has preserved no early charters.

During the three-quarters of a century since Sweet took advice, advances

¹ For an example see p. 117, n. 1 below.

² Many royal charters were signed at places where the king met his counsellors, but it would be hypercritical to attempt to distinguish what a clerk wrote at his home scriptorium from what he wrote when he travelled to such a meeting-place. ³ *O.E.T.*, p. 423.

have been made in the precision of diplomatic studies; yet Dr. Kuhn does not refer to modern authorities on a matter so vital to his argument. The question is not whether Mercian kings of the late eighth and ninth centuries had clerics available to do their writing (it is reasonable to suppose that they had), but whether they kept a central scriptorium or office which was responsible for preparing the charters they signed. Modern authorities seem to be agreed that in England the first clear evidence for the use of clerks in the king's employ to write charters comes from Athelstan's reign (924-39), and it was some time after that before a regular chancery practice was established. There is no evidence that Mercian kings kept a scriptorium or a regular staff for the purpose: one special study reaches the conclusion that royal charters of the eighth and early ninth centuries were usually prepared for signature by the beneficiary, if it was a church.¹ In that case the fact that a king made the grant would have little bearing on the provenance of the script. And if early charters were often prepared by the church that benefited, the archives in which they were preserved should give valuable indications.²

Dr. Kuhn relies on the handwriting of charters for two conclusions. First, he compares the uncials of the Vespasian Psalter and the Golden Gospels with uncials in a charter of Æthelbald, king of Mercia, dated 736, in order to prove that all three scribes were trained in the same Mercian school (p. 611). The specimen plates show that, in general, the two codices are not more alike in script than one would expect in two nearly contemporary English books; but both use a form of *G* which is very rare in uncials,³

¹ See Miss F. E. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs* (Manchester, 1952), pp. 38 ff. for later Anglo-Saxon times. For earlier charters see the references in her note at p. 41; and W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, pp. 120 f. and 221. It is generally agreed that the formal charter was introduced into England by the Church authorities in order to record and secure property and privileges granted to the Church.

² For example, an early charter from the Worcester archives dealing with lands in which the bishop of Worcester was interested would most likely be prepared by clerks of Worcester. The archives of an important church were also places of safe keeping for documents that did not concern it directly. In so far as these relate to persons or lands in the neighbourhood, they are probably local productions. But sometimes duplicates prepared at other centres were deposited for information or to guard against the risk that the text might be lost by fire, &c. When Bishop Oswald decided to put on record in all forms his dealings with the Worcester estates, he sought the approval of King Edgar and the Witan; but of the three copies he prepared, one was kept at Worcester, one was sent to Archbishop Dunstan at Canterbury, and the third to Bishop Athelwold at Winchester (Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, iii. 384). No copy was made for the king; and this suggests that even in Edgar's day, when there is some evidence for royal 'chancery' clerks, central archives were not kept by the king for general purposes of record.

³ Kuhn, p. 594. I have noticed this *G* elsewhere in uncials only in the early eighth-century Avranches Gospels 'written in England' (Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vi (1955), no. 730). Dr. Lowe tells me that he knows of no other certain examples and thinks it unlikely that the capital *G* occurs even occasionally in Northumbrian uncials.

though regular in capitals, and this may be an indication that they come from the same place or the same district. The charter of Æthelbald is compared because it is the only extant specimen of uncials that was probably written in Mercia, not because it had an early connexion with the Vespasian Psalter, as Sweet supposed.¹

This document deals with Worcester lands and comes from the Worcester archives.² Sweet noted that the uncials of the charter proper are unlike those of the Vespasian Psalter;³ they are also unlike those of the Golden Gospels; and there is no example of the rare form of *G* in the main charter or its endorsement. On these points Dr. Kuhn would agree. For a likeness to the two codices he relies not on the main charter, but on its uncial endorsement—less than four lines, so rubbed and creased, and so clipped in his facsimile, that the transcription (p. 610) contains several errors.⁴ On such a specimen it is hard to judge fine points of difference or resemblance; but I venture the opinion that the hand of the uncial endorsement is the same as that of the main charter, which is agreed to be unlike the Psalter hand. The words *comite meo Cyniberhtte* are clear in the endorsement and correspond almost exactly with the same words in the charter.⁵ However that may be, comparison with this Worcester document does not carry the two uncial codices far on the way to Lichfield.

Much greater importance is attached to the evidence of special forms of the letters *z*, *t*, and *ð*. In his first article⁶ Dr. Kuhn studied the occurrence

¹ *O.E.T.*, p. 184. Dr. Kuhn has done a service by printing (p. 604) a letter from the British Museum Department of Manuscripts which should finally dispose of the idea that the charter was part of the Psalter manuscript before Sir Robert Cotton had it bound in for temporary safe keeping.

² For more detail see *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Charters in the B.M.*, i (1873), and Miss D. Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, i (1955), no. 67. There are two minuscule endorsements: *norð stur* in a hand of the latter tenth century (about the time when Bishop Oswald reorganized the Worcester estates), and *Norð stur Æthelbald rex* written well on in the eleventh century. They are evidence of local knowledge as well as of continuing interest, for *North Stur* is not the name given to the estate in the charter, which has *iuxta flumen vocabulo Stur*. Offa claimed that the bishops of Worcester had encroached on Æthelbald's lands in this area (*æt Sture in Usmerum*) and obtained compensation by an agreement of 781 (*Birch, Cart. Sax.*, no. 241). Worcester Cathedral had another copy of Æthelbald's grant of North Stour, which Dugdale saw in 1643: it is item 82 of the list printed in Wanley's Catalogue, p. 300. They may have been persuaded to part with the uncial original on the plea that it was a duplicate.

³ *O.E.T.*, p. 184; cf. Kuhn, p. 610.

⁴ *silla* for *silua*, *vocabuleum* for *-um*, *cum supra dict(um)* *agro* for *-dicto*; *Cyniberhtte* for *-berhtte*.

⁵ Noticeable differences (e.g. the left-hand stroke of *A* goes below the line in the endorsement) are of the kind that appear in longer texts without a change of hand; and they are to be expected if, as seems likely, there was an interval between the writing of the main charter and the record in the endorsement of another grant in the same place and for the same purpose.

⁶ *Speculum*, xviii (1943), 458 ff.

of these forms in the Vespasian Psalter gloss and in comparable charters. Rather than work through the many details he has assembled, it will save time to examine the line of argument, which is, briefly: In the Vespasian gloss a special form of *ð* is common, and there is a sprinkling of clear examples of a special *z* and *t*. These three letter-forms appear in charters of Mercian kings, mostly dating from the early ninth century.¹ Mercian royal charters were written at or near Lichfield. Hence the gloss was probably written into the Psalter at Lichfield in the early part of the ninth century (p. 482).

The special letters² are well illustrated in Dr. Kuhn's plate IIa, taken from a charter of Ceolwulf dated 823, and the specimens here are from the same charter.³ In its typical form the special *ð* is made without lifting the pen, so that the cross-bar is represented by an upward continuation of the bow of *d*, passing through and to the right of the downstroke. The *z* and *t* are examples of a tendency, widespread in early Latin scripts, to swing the top bar from a lower point on the left to a higher point on the right. If this is done with a fine quill pen, held at an angle far from the perpendicular, the bar may take on a hook-shape, with a sharp bend or break where it touches the top of the downstroke before turning upward to the right.⁴

There is a close relation between *t* and the upper part of *z*; and except where they are contrasted, as in Caroline minuscule, these two letters are likely to have the same treatment. But they are in no way related to the special *ð*, which is a deliberate and skilful modification for the sake of speed in writing.⁵ How can the appearance together of these two unrelated developments show where a manuscript was written?

It is conceivable that, by chance, they became features of a type of hand that was developed at one place, and (presumably because that place was isolated) was practised nowhere else. But the evidence assembled from

¹ For several points (pp. 468, 473 n., 475 f.) he relies on Æthelbald's charter of 742, no. 17 in Sweet *O.E.T.*, which I take to be a copy made two or three generations later; cf. 'Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies' in *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xxxix (1954), 310 n. It contains all three special letter-forms much earlier than any other charter.

² W. Keller, *Angelsächsische Palaeographie* (Berlin, 1910), pp. 20 ff. and 34, discusses these. He regards the special *z* and *t* as characteristic of Mercian hands. Wanley (first noted the special *ð*).

³ For the complete charter see *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the B.M.*, ii (1876).

⁴ The variability of the top bar of *z* and *t* is troublesome if its shape is to be used as an indicator of date or provenance. Dr. Kuhn speaks of 'clear', 'doubtful', and 'compromise' forms of *z* and *t*, and allows endless gradations: 'excellent', 'perfect', 'almost perfect', 'fairly clear', 'rather clear', 'rather doubtful', &c. His case is not weakened if all but clear examples are discarded. To go beyond them one would need to consider many more manuscripts.

⁵ Whether it appears first in vernacular texts, or in Latin contractions, is a question that needs to be investigated.

contemporary charters (pp. 468 ff.) shows that the forms are more often found separately than all together. It is conceivable, again, that the special forms of *ʒ*, *t*, and the special form of *ð* had distinct territorial provinces which met at one place only, so that their appearance together is evidence for that place. But no attempt has been made to show that such a place can be ascertained from the geographical limits of the letter-forms; and a successful attempt is unlikely because of the widespread and unpredictable occurrence of the special *ð*, the common form in the Vespasian gloss. In documents that were certainly not written at Lichfield it occurs regularly in the charter of 867 by which Æthelred I, as king of Wessex, makes a provision for the priest Wulfhelm in St. Martin's Church, Canterbury;¹ and regularly in Bishop Wærferth's original Worcester charter of 904.² It appears in parts of the Hatton *Pastoral Care* from the last decade of the ninth century; and (as Mr. Ker tells me) in the Preface of the contemporary MS. Tiberius B XI written at Winchester. It is usual in the latter part of the late tenth-century gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels (p. 466), copied in the neighbourhood of Durham; but not in the earlier part of the same gloss, or in the contemporary *Durham Ritual* gloss. It is common in the Northumbrian part of the late tenth-century gloss to the Rushworth Gospels, but in the Mercian part Farman has the normal *ð* with rare exceptions.³ And the special form survived the Norman Conquest. Perhaps it is safe to say that it is not to be expected in normal West Saxon manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

Generally, then, the appearance together of these three letter-forms is unlikely to help in the exact localization of manuscripts. But we are dealing with a particular case—with the evidence they provide for Lichfield as against Canterbury.

No early charters are known to have been written at Lichfield or to come from the Lichfield archives. In the only one of the five manuscripts discussed for which there is specific though disputed evidence of a Lichfield connexion, and in the one piece of English which Dr. Kuhn (pp. 622, 628) thinks was in it before it left Lichfield—i.e. the *Call to Prayer*⁴ at the beginning of the Book of Cerne—*ð* is normal: there is no instance of the special form.⁵ And although the top bars of *ʒ* and *t* are often swung in the Latin

¹ Sweet, *O.E.T.*, no. 31.

² *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the B.M.* iii (1877); or Keller, *Angelsächsische Palaeographie*, pl. iv.

³ Farman prefers *þ*. By a slip *O.E.D.* under *Th* says that he uses *þ* only; see also Sievers-Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik*, § 199, n. 1. At the beginning of St. Mark *ð* is especially frequent.

⁴ Ed. Sweet, *O.E.T.*, p. 174.

⁵ Professor Bruce Dickins has kindly confirmed this by a close examination of the rubbed and faded page. I have attributed to Lichfield the quire in Vespasian B vi containing lists of bishops, kings, &c., and dating from about 812 (*Cynewulf* (British Academy,

text of this manuscript, the hook-shaped forms are not characteristic of its script.

What then of Canterbury? In eight¹ of the charters listed (pp. 468 ff. and 472) the three letter-forms are found together. Of these, two are duplicate records of the settlement of 825 that righted wrongs done to Archbishop Wulfred by the Mercian royal house, and it is drafted in terms that one would not expect from a clerk in the king's service. Two more record transactions between Archbishop Wulfred and his Cathedral in which the king had no part. In two the Mercian king transfers land in Kent to Archbishop Wulfred, and in one the king grants him land in Middlesex. In the remaining one the king grants land in Kent to Alderman Oswulf who transfers it forthwith to the monastery of Lyminge in Kent. Seven of the eight are from the Canterbury archives. This does not prove that the charters were written by clerks of Canterbury: rather it makes practically impossible the proof that they were written by somebody else. After all discounting of the evidence from other documents, Dr. Kuhn has to concede that during the period of Mercian hegemony, when several archbishops were Mercians, the characteristic Mercian pointed hand was written at Canterbury (pp. 476, 480, 482).

He has still a suggestion to save this desperate case. The presumption to be destroyed is that the Vespasian Psalter was at St. Augustine's when the gloss was added to it in the ninth century, and the suggestion runs: No charters written at that period are known to come from the Abbey (p. 482); they are all from Christ Church, the Cathedral. From 760 onwards there was a bitter and prolonged feud between the Cathedral and the Abbey about rights of cemetery (p. 483). Besides, the Cathedral was the stronghold of the Mercian party, the Abbey a centre of the rebellious Kentish party (ibid.). So St. Augustine's may have excluded Mercians and the Mercian style of writing, to which the Vespasian gloss belongs: and in that case, the Psalter must have been somewhere else when the gloss was added.

The supposed political and cultural rift between Christ Church and St. Augustine's has a slender basis of fact. From Bede² and from tombs it

1933), reprinted in *Studies in the History of OE. Literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 4 f.; and 'Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies', *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xxxix (1954), esp. pp. 289 and 330). It has both forms of *ð*. Keller, *Angelsächsische Palaeographie*, p. 21, doubted whether the British Museum palaeographers were right in describing it as Mercian, because he could find no examples of the special *ʒ* or *t* in the plate given in *Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the B.M.*, ii. Perhaps some examples on f. 109a would satisfy his definition of the special *ʒ*. On the evidence of specimen plates it is unsafe to say that a letter-form does not occur in a manuscript.

¹ I exclude Æthelbald's charter of 842 (above p. 117; n. 1) but it too comes from the Canterbury archives, and has a special interest for the archbishop.

² *Hist. Eccl.* i, ch. xxxiii.

is known that before 760 archbishops of Canterbury were buried at the Abbey. In that year Cuthberht was buried at Christ Church and his successor Breguwine was also buried there; in 792 Archbishop Iænbeorht, who had been Abbot of St. Augustine's, was buried in the Abbey: later archbishops were buried at Christ Church. The change may have caused a feud, or there may have been some bargain or compensation which would account for the absence of any record of an appeal to Rome by the Abbey. As Levison says: 'We do not know when the claims of the Augustinians for their monastery became the subject of a feud.'¹ All the references to the quarrel are post-Conquest, and reflect the prolonged and bitter post-Conquest controversy about the privileges of the Abbey and the rights of the archbishop. In its course forgery was used by both sides: the Abbey employed a foreign expert in that art,² Evidence invented in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries was accepted in good faith by later monks of the Abbey like William Thorne, and their accounts should not be relied on for the facts about early Anglo-Saxon times. One thing is certain: Offa did not treat Christ Church as of the Mercian party and St. Augustine's as of the Kentish or anti-Mercian party, for he struck at the power of the Archbishop of Canterbury, not, as far as is known, at St. Augustine's. There is really no evidence that at any time before the Norman Conquest the two neighbouring churches used distinguishable styles of writing.

The same three letter-forms are used to settle the date of the Vespasian gloss-hand. Sweet, who had a wide experience of early vernacular writing, says: 'it cannot well be earlier or later than the first half of the ninth century.'³ Dr. Kuhn prefers 'the first third of the ninth century' (pp. 473 f.) and thinks it 'virtually impossible' that it 'could have been written as late as Alfred's reign' (p. 605). The British Museum palaeographers, with more experience of Latin writing, and the advantage of familiarity with a manuscript in their keeping, date it 'late ninth century',⁴ even 'ninth or tenth century',⁵ which means much the same as Keller's 'um 900'.⁶

The special letter-forms are only three among many details that a palaeographer should take into account, and the question is whether they point clearly to the earlier date. Enough has been said at p. 118 above to show that the occurrence of the special *ð* cannot help in close dating. But Dr. Kuhn notes (p. 466) that in the Psalter gloss this letter-form is often botched: instead of being written economically without lifting the pen, it is made in two strokes, the first completing the *d* part of the letter, the

¹ *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, p. 206.

² Levison, *op. cit.*, pp. 178 ff., esp. p. 212.

³ *O.E.T.*, p. 184.

⁴ *Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the B.M.*, ii. 10.

⁵ Sir George Warner, *Illuminated MSS. in the B.M.* (1903)

⁶ *Angelsächsische Palaeographie*, p. 22.

second adding the cross on the right of the downstroke. I have found no clear example of this in early ninth-century charters, though it is noticeable in the late tenth-century Northumbrian gloss to the Rushworth Gospels. It may fairly be regarded as a degeneration from the type.

Then again, in Ceolwulf's charter of 823 (which Dr. Kuhn chooses as typical in his plate II*a*) the special *z* and *t* are clear and regular: the horizontal bar is confined to certain special combinations, such as *e**z* where the tongue of *e* makes the top bar of *z*, and there are no intermediate forms. In the Psalter gloss the special forms are a minority, and every gradation between the hook-shaped and the plain horizontal top may be found. This too is a symptom of degeneration, consistent with relative lateness.

How late are the special forms of *z* and *t* likely to occur? Since their peculiarity is only a variety of flourish, they may appear sporadically at almost any time: in MS. Galba A XIV, a prayer book of the early eleventh century written by nuns of Winchester, there are good examples on f. 104^a. A more consistent witness is the Parker Chronicle,¹ certainly written after 892 and probably at Winchester. In this manuscript *z* and *t* happen to be contrasted: *t* has the horizontal and *z* usually the swung top bar. And there are many instances of *z* (e.g. *cyning* f. 11^a l. 8, *onfeng* l. 9, *geare* l. 25) in which the hook-shape is as clear as in most examples of the Vespasian gloss. So a minority of the special forms of *z* and *t* in the Vespasian gloss is not evidence that it was written early in the ninth century.

But perhaps the difference between Sweet and Kuhn on the one hand and the specialists in palaeography on the other is to be explained by a point of method. Sweet and Kuhn rely on a comparison with charters, which is generally the best way of dating an Anglo-Saxon book-hand. Yet anybody who relies on charters will inevitably find the nearest hands to the Vespasian gloss in the first half of the ninth century, because there are no original or contemporary charters in this type of hand after 850. The Vespasian gloss is in a kind of pointed minuscule which is Mercian in the sense that it was a characteristic hand of the period of Mercian dominance. Most early charters come from southern archives, especially from those of Christ Church, and Mercian rule there ended in 825, when Kent became a permanent part of the West Saxon kingdom. Such political events are not likely to affect handwriting instantly; but from 850 onwards another style, sometimes looser and rougher, sometimes rounder and more massive, displaces the pointed minuscule in surviving charters; and in such hands the hook-shaped top of *z* and *t* is not likely to appear. But the pointed style did not disappear everywhere. The glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual show that in the second half of the tenth century it was still used in northern England for interlinear glosses, where its compactness

¹ See the complete facsimile ed. R. Flower and A. H. Smith (E.E.T.S., 1941).

was an advantage. I doubt whether many who compare Ceolwulf's charter of 823, the Vespasian gloss, and the Durham Ritual gloss,¹ will regard as probable a view of historical development that makes the first two strictly contemporary and the third about a century and a half later.

So the detailed investigations of handwriting have failed to produce evidence that the Vespasian Psalter text was written at Lichfield rather than at Canterbury; or evidence that enables us to set aside the opinion of good palaeographical authorities that its gloss was added late in the ninth century, or about the year 900.

V. Evidence from Language

Specialists in language may be disappointed that so many excursions into peripheral subjects have produced doubts and difficulties rather than certainty about the times and places at which our manuscripts were written. When we come to the linguistic evidence, all phonological, Dr. Kuhn is on ground with which he is thoroughly familiar. His accounts of dialect forms in the Old English texts deserve careful consideration: they are clear, concise, and full of facts. Yet here too the weakness persists which I have criticized elsewhere in his arguments. The facts are brought to bear on the problem of localization by means of doubtful assumptions and interpretations. He does not examine the question with which we are primarily concerned, i.e. the value of linguistic forms as evidence of the place where an Anglo-Saxon manuscript was written. The underlying theory must be inferred from his explanations, and it is simple: A text that exhibits a pure dialect was probably written into the manuscript at the heart of the dialect area. Thus the early gloss to the Vespasian Psalter is reasonably pure Mercian (pp. 605 ff.), and this suits the attribution of the Psalter to Lichfield, which he regards as the capital of Mercia: 'the purity and consistency of the dialect in the Psalter-gloss renders any provenience in the outlying regions of Mercia very unlikely' (p. 629). Again, the eleventh-century glosses in the same manuscript are pure West Saxon; so they were probably added to it in the neighbourhood of Winchester,² the West Saxon capital (pp. 607, 628). On the other hand, a text that exhibits an

¹ Of the three plates in the edition by U. Lindelöf (*Surtees Soc.* cxl, 1927), the second is best for comparison with the Vespasian Psalter because it shows the gloss over a majuscule text.

² This is Wildhagen's opinion, *Festschrift für L. Morsbach* (Halle, 1913), p. 440. The occurrence of the same gloss in MS. Junius 27, almost certainly a Winchester manuscript, written *circa* 925, might seem to support this conjecture. But Wildhagen, who assumes direct transcription from the Vespasian Psalter, has a more elaborate explanation (*op. cit.*, p. 446). I think it unlikely that the Junius gloss was transcribed directly from the Vespasian MS. There is a tendency to underestimate the number of copies of such common books as the psalter that were available in Anglo-Saxon times.

inconsistent or mixed dialect was probably written into the manuscript in an outlying part of the dialect area.

In Dr. Kuhn's view the Latin of Tiberius C II was written at Lichfield; but he finds that its early glosses¹ show Anglian and West Saxon features, and suggests that it was at Worcester² when they were added (pp. 614, 618). Similarly, he finds that the dialect of the ninth-century glosses³ in the *Booke of Cerne* is mixed, and thinks (pp. 622, 628) that they were added after it had been transferred from Lichfield to some place nearer Cerne Abbey, the late tenth-century foundation in Dorset that was its final home in the Middle Ages.

I need not repeat what I have said in another place about the scantiness and vagueness of our knowledge of Old English local dialects,⁴ or detail the complications that copying and revision may produce. But the movement from place to place of persons concerned with the production of books is an important factor in our problem. Anglo-Saxon farmers, fishermen, craftsmen, and labourers were comparatively immobile. The oral preservation of local dialects depended on them, but they were not writers or readers. The recording of English depended on the better-educated clergy and their patrons, who had many occasions for travelling or changing their residence. So far Dr. Kuhn would agree. As the begetters of the five manuscripts under consideration he thinks of kings and bishops, who were exceptionally mobile; and his explanations assume movement: he makes all five manuscripts change homes at least once in medieval times; he supposes that Alderman Ælfred found the Golden Gospels on a journey into heathen territory; and suggests that a Northumbrian visiting Worcester added *nostro* before St. Cuthbert's name in Tiberius C II. How then can we expect a style of ornament or handwriting, or a type of a commonly used text, or a form of written speech, to be confined to one place for generations? As an example from language: Can we hope to distinguish, by means of phonological tests, what Ælfric wrote at Winchester in Hampshire from what he wrote at Cerne in Dorset or at Eynsham in Oxfordshire?

¹ Ed. Sweet, *O.E.T.*, pp. 180 ff.

² Although the community of clergy at Worcester was small—probably less than a score of adults up to the time of Bishop Oswald's accession in 961—it is unsafe to assume that they were all recruited from the immediate neighbourhood so that they spoke only one variety of local dialect. Still, there seems to be no evidence that a mixture of Mercian and West Saxon was written at Worcester in the ninth century. For the tenth century the evidence is slight. In the eleventh it becomes abundant. Yet nobody (as far as I know) has specified the mixture of dialect which is supposed to distinguish books produced at Worcester from those produced at other places near the old border between Mercia and Wessex. So Worcester tends to become a limbo for texts that show both Anglian and West Saxon forms.

³ Ed. Sweet, *O.E.T.*, pp. 171 ff.

⁴ *Studies in the History of OE. Literature*, pp. 119 ff.

Canterbury was a city of movement. As a trading centre it was second only to London; it was on the main route for travellers to and from the Continental countries that were most advanced in Christian learning; and it was the ecclesiastical capital of England throughout a period when church-government was more highly organized than secular government. The direct control of the Mercian and West Saxon bishoprics by 'the primate of all England' made official Canterbury responsive to changes in the balance of power between Mercia and Wessex, and gave it an 'all-English' rather than a narrowly Kentish character. The archbishop himself might be Mercian or West Saxon, or even a foreigner; his principal officials could be chosen from an equally wide field; and in the course of administration literate men were constantly sent out from or attracted to the centre of church-government. We should expect this cosmopolitan quality to be accompanied by a lack of dialectal distinctiveness in the Old English written at Canterbury: good specimens of native Kentish might be relatively few, and non-Kentish dialects or forms might be written there.

In fact pre-Conquest specimens of Kentish¹ are remarkably scarce. The earliest are a group of short documents written in the second quarter of the ninth century.² In all of them the archbishop was concerned; they were preserved in the Cathedral archives; and they record gifts or wills made by laymen. There is other evidence that Latin was losing ground at the time,³ but English was better suited to documents of this kind because the lay donors or testators could understand exactly what was put on record; and since these laymen belonged to the neighbourhood of Canterbury, there is some assurance that the undertakings they read, or had read to them, were in English of Kent. Unfortunately the assurance is less because the Anglo-Saxons were so tolerant of dialectal irregularities or differences,⁴ seeming to make the most of common ground where modern scholars emphasize

¹ Canterbury and Kent are not synonymous, but no early evidence is available for other Kentish centres such as Rochester.

² Ed. Sweet, *O.E.T.*, Charters 34 (endorsement) and 37-42. Most of them are more fully edited in Miss F. E. Harmer's *Select English Historical Documents* (1914). The dialect is examined in her Appendix pp. 128-30, and in more detail by A. Campbell in *J.E.G.P.* xxxvii (1938), 142 ff.

³ See Sir Frank Stenton, *The Latin Charters of the Anglo-Saxon Period* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 39 ff.

⁴ Bede's remark (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. ch. v) that the West Saxon king he calls 'Caelin' was called 'Ceaulin' by the West Saxons themselves is a practical necessity if he wished to be understood in all parts of England. Otherwise I cannot recall a reference to dialect differences in pre-Conquest writers. Alfred might have mentioned them in his prefaces, especially when introducing Wærferth's version of Gregory's Dialogues. Ælfric, who had a grammarian's interest in English, seems to have noticed nothing inconsistent with Alfred's authorship in the language of the *OE. Bede*. Farman, who wrote Mercian himself, was content to have the greater part of the Rushworth Gospels glossed in Northumbrian. And irregularities are characteristic of most manuscript texts.

distinctions. These early documents do not altogether conform to a grammarian's ideal of pure Kentish, and it has been suggested that their language bears the marks of the period of Mercian dominance, which was ending when they were written.¹

For a second specimen we must move on to the very beginning of the eleventh century, when an inmate of St. Augustine's copied the *Kentish Glosses*, with their Latin texts, into MS. Vespasian D vi. The copyist, or the predecessor he reproduced, was not schooled in the West Saxon literary tradition: he uses forms of the spoken language (e.g. *-at*, *-et*, *-inc* for *-að*, *-eð*, *-ing*) which were not confined to Kentish, but at this date were usually hidden by the standard spelling; and, with a minority of exceptions, he writes a non-West Saxon dialect which is essentially Kentish. There is no other good specimen before the Conquest.²

This paucity of remains of the Kentish dialect cannot be explained by any prejudice at Canterbury against the use of English. The earliest legal documents in the vernacular come, as we have seen, from the Cathedral archives; Archbishop Plegmund was Alfred's adviser and helper in his plan for translation; Archbishop Dunstan wrote at least one letter in English where Latin might have been used.³ Nor has the loss of early books from Kent been exceptional: on the contrary, the medieval libraries of Canterbury have been relatively well preserved.⁴ The rarity of Kentish is consistent with the view that it was not the usual written English of Canterbury throughout Anglo-Saxon times.⁵

¹ See, for example, R. Vleeskruyer, *The Life of St. Chad* (Amsterdam, 1953), p. 47.

² I leave out of account texts that have more or less of a Kentish colouring. In the *Kentish Psalm*, for example, which is in the same manuscript as the *Kentish Glosses*, though possibly by a different hand, it is doubtful whether the many Kentish forms are original. For the three synonymous words (and derivatives) *gylt*, *synn*, *scyld*, the first two of which must have been in constant use, it has 4 *gylt*: 2 *gelt*; 9 *synn*: 1 *senn*; 3 *sceld*.

³ *Crawford Charters*, ed. A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson (1895), pp. 18 f.

⁴ According to the lists in N. R. Ker's *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (1941), far more manuscripts have been identified as coming from Canterbury than from Winchester, Worcester, and Durham combined.

⁵ That the one good late example of Old Kentish comes from St. Augustine's, while the examples of West Saxon cited below (p. 126) are from Christ Church, may raise the question whether there was some difference between the two houses that is likely to appear in the language, script, or ornament of books. The total number of clear examples is so small that mere chance is a possible explanation of their distribution; and it may be significant that the late tenth-century Bosworth Psalter, which offers many kinds of evidence, including a calendar of saints and derivative glosses whose phonology is West Saxon, is assigned by Bishop and Gasquet to Christ Church in *The Bosworth Psalter* (1908), pp. 34 ff., and by Professor Wormald to St. Augustine's in *English Kalendars before A.D. 1100*, i (Henry Bradshaw Soc., 1934).

If chance is excluded, it might be suggested that St. Augustine's, as compared with Christ Church, was slow to accept the great revival of religion and learning in the later tenth century that did so much to spread the influence of Winchester and of literary West

For the history of the Vespasian Psalter, which is the centre of interest in Dr. Kuhn's articles, we must consider whether good Mercian is likely to have been written into it at Canterbury in the ninth century, and good West Saxon in the eleventh.

The answer to the second part of the question is clear: West Saxon, the literary dialect of England at the time, is to be expected at Canterbury in the first half of the eleventh century. Since 825 Kent had been part of the West Saxon kingdom. Except for Dunstan, who was certainly a West Saxon, all the archbishops elected in the tenth century were promoted from south-western sees. In eleventh-century books written at Canterbury fairly consistent West Saxon is found: e.g. in the interlinear gloss to the *Liber Scintillarum*,¹ and the prayers in MS. Arundel 155.² The best authenticated original charters from Canterbury in the first half of the century are also in West Saxon.³ Post-Conquest texts from Canterbury, such as Chronicle F, are basically West Saxon with more or less Kentish colouring. So the fact that its eleventh-century glosses are in good West Saxon is not evidence that the Psalter was at Winchester, or somewhere else than Canterbury, when they were added.

Saxon. But because it encourages reading, writing, and study, such a movement favours the recording of things that may seem to be outside or even opposed to the new trends. Not only the *Kentish Glosses*, but the contemporary Mercian *Royal Glosses*, the dialect glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Rushworth Gospels, and the Durham Ritual, as well as most of the older poetry, survive because they were recorded in the hey-day of the Benedictine Reform.

Alternatively, it might be suggested that in the period before Archbishop Lanfranc dealt so sternly with the Abbey, there was a rift between it and the West Saxon archbishops as deep as that which Dr. Kuhn supposes to have existed in the days of Mercian rule (above, p. 119). Against this there is clear evidence at the critical time. About the year 1000, Abbot Wulfric of St. Augustine's sent the prose life of Archbishop Dunstan to Abbo of Fleury to be versified 'pro amore magnifici viri Sancti Dunstani' (Stubbs, *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (Rolls Series, 1874), p. 409). Two early recensions of this prose life were made at the Abbey (op. cit., pp. xxvii ff.); and they repeat the priest B's picture of Dunstan walking over to St. Augustine's to pray in the quietness of the night there, as a relief from the press of callers and business that occupied his days in the Cathedral ('propter multimodam populorum ad se venientium inhaesionem vel etiam aliorum multorum occupationem', op. cit., p. 48). Here we have a real and permanent difference between the neighbouring houses: the one was the metropolitan church in a busy city, the other a monastery outside the city walls. In the monastery one would expect a higher proportion of men from Kentish families who had no occasion to leave it, or to concern themselves with the business of the Church all over England. So perhaps it is not just chance that the chief Middle Kentish text, Dan Michel of Northgate's *Ayenbite*, was also written at St. Augustine's.

¹ Ed. E. W. Rhodes (E.E.T.S., 1889) from B.M. MS. Royal 7 C IV, a Christ Church book.

² Ed. F. Holthausen in *Anglia*, lxxv (1941), 230 ff. On the probability that some of these prayers were composed as well as copied at Christ Church see K. Sisam, *Studies*, p. 153.

³ e.g. the chirographs Augustus II 70 of 1044, Augustus II 35, and Augustus II 34, in *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the B.M.* iv (1878).

The case of the Mercian gloss is complicated by the difference of opinion about its date. It is a copy, not a gloss made for the Vespasian Psalter,¹ and its handwriting, as well as its reasonably uniform language, indicates that the copyist was Mercian or Mercian-trained. In the period to which Professor Kuhn assigns the gloss hand—the first third of the ninth century—the presence of Mercian clergy at Canterbury is likely enough. Kent did not pass finally into West Saxon control until 825, and there is no reason to think that Mercian clergy were at once eliminated from Canterbury. The archbishop had regained control of all the Mercian sees in 803. As late

¹ The exceptional number of careless spellings left uncorrected in the gloss is naturally explained by mechanical copying; yet many of them might be due to an author: e.g. 32.8 *yimbhwyrst*; 37.21 *esterfylgende*; 39.13 *heasdes*; where *s* stands for *f* because, as in common *d* for *ð*, a final stroke has been omitted. Better evidence for copying is the confusion of *y*: *u*, as in 64.5 *hyses*; 57.5 *fordutteende*; and originally at 58.12 *ðu*; 67.3 *synfyllan*; 68.25 *ebulgðu*, &c. This points to the use of *v* for *u* in the pattern gloss. The *v* form appears in 54.4 *synfullan* and, by correction from *y*, in 142.8 *cvðne*. In early Latin scripts it occurs in interlineations, where it is neat and distinctive, and it is usual in the late tenth-century gloss to the Durham Ritual.

The best evidence of copying is provided by a number of glosses which translate a variant reading known or likely to occur in the tradition of the Roman Psalter. Here some sifting of the apparent examples is necessary: (i) 52.2 *lustum*: *uoluntatibus*; but the confusion of *uoluntas*: *uoluptas*, with an intermediary *volumptas*, is common in Late Latin; cf. *villum*: *voluptatibus* Lindisfarne Luke viii. 14. Similarly *exult*: *exalt*—are often confused in psalter texts, e.g. 83.3; 113.6; or 50.16 where *uphefeð* has been erased before *gefið* glossing *exultabit*. (ii) Some spellings of the time are ambiguous, e.g. 79.17 *effosa* is glossed *agoten* instead of *adolfen* because in early Insular spelling it could represent both *effossa* and *effusa*. (iii) Occasionally Sweet's print of the Latin is at fault, e.g. 40.7 *uteodon ut ond werun spreocende*: *egrediebatur foras et loquebatur*, where the manuscript has *egrediebantur* . . . *loquebantur*. (iv) The Latin text has been altered in many places; and Sweet, if he notices the change, usually prints the earlier reading even if the gloss renders the later, e.g. 7.3 *se ðe hie hale gedoe*: *qui saluum faciat*, but *saluum* altered to *saluam* (sc. *animam*); 21.30 *forðgað*: *prociidunt* altered to *procedunt*; 29.13 *singe*: *cantet* altered from *cantem*; 62.3 in *wet(r)igre stowe*: *in inaquoso* altered to *in aquoso*; 68.5 *unrehtwiselice ða*: *iniusti qui altered to iniuste que*.

There remains a significant number of glosses which translate a variant that is not in the Vespasian Latin, but is known from other Anglo-Saxon psalters (only one is quoted for each). I have mentioned elsewhere (*Studies*, p. 4 n.) 67. 31 *ðu ðreades* glossing *increpaferas* as if it were *increpaueras*, where the Regius Psalter (B.M. Royal MS. 2 B v = D) has *increpaferas* with the marginal note 'increpaueras'. Other examples are: 17.45 *from gehernisse* glossing *obauditu* translates *ab auditu* D; 43.15 *onwendnisse* glossing *commotionem* translates *commutationem* (C.U.L. MS. Ff. 1. 23, ed. K. Wildhagen, Hamburg, 1910, and D originally); 43.15 *we gefyllað* glossing *in plebibus* translates *inplebimus* which was the original reading of MS. Junius 27 = B; 57.6 *gehered* (for *-ed*) glossing *exaudient* translates *exaudiet* D; 57.6 *galdurcreftas* glossing *uenefici* translates *ueneficia* of the Vulgate; 105.38 *ofslegen* glossing *infecta* translates *interfecta* D; 119.4 *tolesendes* glossing *desolatoris* translates *desolatoris* D, confused with *desolut*-. I cannot quote a variant *elat*- for 17.27 *mid ðy upahafenan upahafen ðu bist* glossing *cum electo electus eris*, but it points to copying. The confusion of *ec*: *a* is hardly possible in the clear uncials of the Vespasian manuscript, but is easy in those insular hands that write *a* in the form of *oc* conjoined; and the parallel *dilatasti* for 29.2 *delectasti* is witnessed in English psalters from the tenth century (D) up to the ME. Metrical Version, ed. J. Stevenson (Surtees Society, 1845).

as 836 he took part in a council of the Mercian king held at Croft in Leicestershire.¹

But we have seen (above, pp. 120 ff.) that the fresh arguments for dating the handwriting of the gloss so early will not hold; and that Sir George Warner, the highest palaeographical authority on such a point, assigned it to the late ninth or even the early tenth century. At that time the copying of a Mercian gloss at Canterbury is readily explained. Plegmund, a Mercian, apparently from West Mercia, was archbishop there from 890 to 914 (?). He has claims to be considered the inspirer of Alfred's plan for education through translation, and Mercian scholars took the lead in translating. Plegmund might be expected to give special attention to service books, of which the psalter was the most used and the most difficult. One practical way of helping the clergy to understand the psalms that were so constantly on their lips was to bring a word-for-word interlinear version from Mercia, or to encourage a Mercian to make it.² Once such a gloss was available, the policy of the time was to spread copies among other leading churches, and St. Augustine's was the nearest to Canterbury Cathedral.

To sum up on the Vespasian Psalter. It was certainly the book Elmham described in the early fifteenth century as an ancient treasure of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and Leland saw it there on the eve of the Dissolution. In Elmham's day it was treated with special honour as a gift from St. Augustine himself, who was thought to have received it from Gregory the Great. In fact it is English work, probably of the eighth century, possibly of the late seventh. A Mercian gloss, made apparently by a West Mercian, for a text of the Roman Psalter which sometimes differed from the Vespasian Latin, was added later. The best palaeographical authority dates the gloss-hand round about 900, which should not be pressed more closely than, say, 'somewhere between 875 and 925'. A rather earlier date is possible because comparable documents are scarce at the time; but a date early in the ninth century would be out of line with the development shown in the material available for comparison. Some late additions to the Latin text were glossed in West Saxon in the eleventh century. There is nothing in the manuscript that is unlikely to have been written at Canterbury, and there is no evidence that it was ever at Winchester or Lichfield.

¹ Cf. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2nd edn., 1947), pp. 231 f.

² Dr. Kuhn thinks such glosses had a liturgical use, i.e. that they helped the priest as he read the Latin text in the church service (pp. 462 and 629). But a gloss was more likely to distract his eye from the text, and it is improbable that churches of the rank of St. Augustine's or Lichfield Cathedral depended on lectors who could not read the psalms intelligibly from carefully pointed manuscripts. Interlinear glosses were intended for private study and reference in days when there was no other ready way of finding out the meaning of a word or phrase in the psalter.

VI. Lichfield

In the course of this discussion the claims of Canterbury have been opposed to the claims of Lichfield, because that was the prescribed theme. I should be sorry to leave the impression that the choice of a place of origin for the manuscripts considered could be so simplified. In the eighth and ninth centuries there were many places in England capable of producing fine books. On general considerations the claims of Rochester, Minster in Thanet, London, Peterborough, York, Leicester, Worcester, Hereford might be asserted, and they are only some of the obvious possibilities. For precise localization specific evidence is necessary. General considerations—political, ecclesiastical, or cultural—may indicate the kind of place where something was done, or the broad territorial limits within which it was done; but we could not infer or even guess from them that, for example, St. Boniface had his training at Exeter on the outermost fringe of Saxon conquest and at the tiny 'Nutshell' (Nursling, Hants); or that the greatest Anglo-Saxon prose work, Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, was composed at Cerne in Dorset; or that the splendid Rushworth Gospels were owned and partly glossed in Mercian by Farman the priest at Harewood in the West Riding of Yorkshire. The attempt to localize manuscripts exactly from general considerations leads almost certainly to a fallacious concentration on a few well-known centres like Winchester, Worcester, and Canterbury itself; and now that Worcester has become associated with mixed dialect and styles,¹ there is some risk that Lichfield will be added to the short list as the home of good Mercian.

Lichfield is more prominent in Dr. Kuhn's conclusions than in his detailed argument. Only for the Book of Cerne, among the five manuscripts discussed, is there specific evidence for a Lichfield connexion, and that depends on the identity of a Bishop Æthelwald. Most of the argument rests on the assumption that typically Mercian handwriting or dialect points to production at Lichfield. It is said to have been the capital of Mercia; the place where royal and fine liturgical manuscripts are to be expected because it was 'a royal residence and a powerful religious house'; the place where 'a political capital and a religious foundation dwelt together harmoniously' (p. 629). This gives the impression that Lichfield in the eighth and ninth centuries had a status and influence comparable with that of Winchester in the tenth and eleventh.

Yet Lichfield was not the capital of Mercia, nor, as far as is known, a royal residence. The great Mercian city was London, and it was a royal residence (*villa regalis*, *oppidum regale*) as well as a bishop's seat; but Anglo-Saxon London is *terra incognita* for philologists and palaeographers. The

¹ See above, p. 123, n. 2.

western half of Mercia, with which we are concerned, was a rural area, having no great centre of population, trade, and communications like London, Canterbury, or York. Of several small towns or large villages, from Derby in the north to Worcester in the south, Tamworth might be called the political capital: it was the favourite residence of the kings, and the Witan met oftenest there. At Lichfield, some twenty miles away, no meeting of the Witan is recorded. It was the bishop's seat, of especial sanctity because St. Chad, the first bishop of the Mercians, established his see and was buried there. In 787, when Offa had secured the creation of a Mercian archbishopric, Hygeberht was made archbishop at Lichfield. We may suppose that Offa selected the man and the place to secure his own dominance, which a stiff-necked archbishop at London might have resisted. But the experiment failed. Negotiations to end it were begun by King Cenwulf in 797, the year after Offa's death, and from that time Mercian bishops made their professions of obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury. With this hard experience of the supposed harmonious working of church and state, Hygeberht resigned to avoid deposition when the Lichfield archbishopric was finally abolished in 803. His goodness is attested, but in one of the stormiest periods in the early history of the English Church he was not the man to assert his authority from the seclusion of Lichfield.

For it was always a small, secluded place, of which very little is recorded in Anglo-Saxon times. It seems to have kept something of the humbleness and simplicity of its founder St. Chad, who had not visited and admired the great churches of Gaul and Italy as Wilfrid and Benedict Biscop did; and something too of his Celtic piety, which later contact with Lindisfarne and Wales would reinforce. As early evidence, note Bede's account of St. Chad's shrine: 'His grave is covered by a wooden tomb in the shape of a little house, with a hole in its side-wall, through which the devout who come there put in their hands to get a portion of the dust.'¹ And four centuries later we have William of Malmesbury's description: 'Lichfield is a little town (*villa exigua*) in Staffordshire, far from the crowds of cities. The country around is wooded and a stream flows by. Its church is cramped, exemplifying the modesty and austerity of earlier times. Bishops of our day would be ashamed of a seat so unequal to their dignity.'² The Book of Cerne, Celtic in spirit, full of old-fashioned and out-of-the-way texts, might come from such a place in its best days. One would not expect it to be the source of practically all the surviving ornamented books that England south of the Humber produced in the eighth and early ninth centuries.

¹ *Hist. Eccl.* iv, ch. iii.

² *Gesta Pontificum*, ed. Hamilton (Rolls Series, 1870), p. 307.

Its claims to vernacular texts—the original from which the Vespasian gloss was copied, the *Old English Bede*,¹ the English Life of its own St. Chad²—cannot be neglected, but as yet no specific evidence has been adduced that any of these was composed at Lichfield.

¹ See T. Miller in his edition (E.E.T.S., 1890–8), p. lxix. There is no variation from the literal translation of Bede's account of St. Chad (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. ch. ii) that suggests a special interest in Lichfield. The translator writes: 'Hæfde he biscopseðl in þære stowe þe geceged is Liccedfeld, þær he forðferde ond bebyrged is, þær gen' &c. And he makes an important part of Bede's story unintelligible when he renders *oratorium*, the little separate cell where Chad retired to read and pray with chosen companions, by *cirice* which should stand for the cathedral church.

² Ed. R. Vleeskruyer (Amsterdam, 1953), pp. 70 f. Here too Lichfield is mentioned with no sign of special interest: 'He hefde eft biscopseld in ðære stowe seo is gecweden Licetfeld', &c.; and nothing is added to Bede's account of the saint from local tradition.

LANGLAND, HILTON, AND THE THREE LIVES

By S. S. HUSSEY

IN the second part of *Piers Plowman*—the *Vita* as it is usually called—the Dreamer engages in a search for Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, three abstractions of which he knows neither the whereabouts nor the meaning. Furthermore, the colophons of the manuscripts divide the *Vita* into three parts, with the general titles *Vita de Dowel*, *Vita de Dobet*, *Vita de Dobest*. Critics of the poem have been at least as puzzled as the Dreamer, and have sought to elucidate these terms, often by equating them with standard triads in medieval religious thought. The present paper is offered as an investigation of the work of these critics, in the hope that, by sifting the evidence, we might reach a better understanding of the concepts.

Late nineteenth-century criticism of *Piers Plowman* saw it as a great 'social document', without fully realizing its importance as a great poem, and in the early years of this century it was still possible to speak of the looseness and non-co-ordination of the work.¹ It was in an attempt to show that *Piers Plowman* is in fact carefully planned beneath a somewhat rough surface that H. W. Wells advanced the view that Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest are the principal organizing factors in the poem, and are to be equated respectively with the active, contemplative, and mixed lives of the mystics.² N. K. Coghill took up the same idea using different terminology (the 'lewed' life of Dowel, the 'clerkly' life of Dobet, and the 'episcopal' life of Dobest) and argued that Piers was a personification of each life in turn, representing Dowel in the *Visio*, and Dobet and Dobest in the sections of the poem that bear those titles. *The Vita de Dowel*, Coghill thought, was a moral consideration of all three lives.³ Wells, however, protested against what he called an over-literal approach by Coghill. He restated his original thesis with the proviso that Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest should not be identified with vocational callings but should be interpreted as mental states, which, although the names suggested an ascending scale, could be experienced in

¹ On the alleged looseness of construction see, for example, E. D. Hanscom, 'The Argument of the *Vision of Piers Plowman*', *P.M.L.A.* ix (1894), 412; C. W. Stubbs, *The Christ of English Poetry* (London, 1906), p. 77; E. Legouis, *A History of English Literature* (London, 1926), p. 71.

² 'The Construction of *Piers Plowman*', *P.M.L.A.* xlv (1929), 123-40.

³ 'The Character of *Piers Plowman* considered from the B Text', *M.Æ.* ii (1933), 108-35. I cannot agree that the *Vita de Dowel* sets out to expound the moral nature of all three lives. Piers does not make an appearance in this section, but Dowel seems still to be the author's main concern. The colophons (whoever supplied them) appear to me to be adequate descriptions of the progress of the poem.

greater or less degree by every Christian, no matter what his social position.¹ To this R. W. Chambers agreed.²

Since the time of Chambers, and partly as a result of his great authority in *Piers Plowman* scholarship, the view of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest as active, contemplative, and mixed lives has become the standard critical interpretation. It is important to note, however, that Chambers was supporting Wells's second article: that the concepts are psychological not sociological, states not estates; but later discussion has often tended to follow Coghill's designation of them as 'lewed', 'clerkly', and 'episcopal'. This idea gained currency by means of Coghill's British Academy Lecture of 1945.³ A still more recent view, that of D. W. Robertson and B. F. Huppé, also derives from the articles of Wells:

The allegorical level, for example, is concerned with the church, and the basic classification of persons in the poem under Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest rests on the traditional division of persons in the church as active, contemplative, and prelatial. More exactly, Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest represent the ideals which persons in these states should follow. Actual persons either exemplify these ideals or their corruption.⁴

The vagueness of the language here allows more scope to the poet than the views of Wells, Coghill, and Chambers, who give the impression (perhaps unintentionally) that Langland simply repeated standard teachings of the Doctors of the Church as passed on by fourteenth-century writers. But Robertson and Huppé are really making only a somewhat less extreme statement than those of their predecessors, and if they, as specialists, are somewhat more circumspect, the general view of the meaning of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest is still repeated in books which do not discuss the poem in detail:

Do-wel is the active life, the life of the good layman; Do-bet is the contemplative life, the life of the man of a religious order; Do-best is the life of the highest human responsibility made possible by the union of activity and contemplation, the life of the Bishop.⁵

The error, I think, lies in the type of criticism that, having perceived some correspondences between Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest and the active, contemplative, and mixed lives, proceeds to equate the two triads, thereby limiting the interpretation of the former. The present article does not seek to invalidate Coghill's contention that *Piers* makes three grand appearances

¹ 'The Philosophy of *Piers Plowman*', *P.M.L.A.* liii (1938), 339-49.

² *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (London, 1939), esp. pp. 102-6.

³ 'The Pardon of *Piers Plowman*', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* xxxi (1945), 303-57.

⁴ *Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition* (Princeton, 1951), pp. 236-7.

⁵ E. M. W. Tillyard, *The English Epic and its Background* (London, 1954), p. 166.

in the poem—one for each kind of life—but discusses what these three lives represent.

In support of this argument Wells brought evidence from St. Thomas Aquinas and the *Meditationes*, wrongly attributed to St. Bonaventura but certainly translated into English by Nicholas Love in the early years of the fifteenth century.¹ Chambers sought support from the writings of Walter Hilton, particularly *Mixed Life*.² In his article in *Medium Ævum*, Coghill listed the various definitions of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest given in the poem. It ought to be possible, therefore, to test these arguments by examining whether the definitions in *Piers Plowman* suggest an equation of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest with active, contemplative, and mixed lives as defined by the writers mentioned above. It is doubtful how far the writings of St. Thomas can be used to interpret *Piers Plowman*. Coghill says that he was 'certainly known, at least by hearsay, to Langland'.³ M. W. Bloomfield, on the other hand, speaks of a 'vague anti-Thomism' in Langland's work, but his references do not seem very conclusive.⁴ Miss Hort considers it unlikely that Langland had read the *Summa*, but thinks that he had picked up something of its teaching by talking to those who had.⁵ Father Dunning makes extensive use of St. Thomas, but only on points of doctrine generally accepted in the Middle Ages.⁶ It is interesting to note that Robertson and Huppé refuse to use the *Summa Theologica* to interpret *Piers Plowman* because of Langland's constant criticism of the friars.⁷ As far as I can discover, Langland never quotes directly from St. Thomas, although where St. Thomas is passing on the teaching of earlier writers he may seem to echo him. Love's translation of the *Meditationes* (licensed for reading by Archbishop Arundel in 1410) was later than *Piers Plowman*. Hilton, though, seems a much more valuable witness. As Chambers states, he was probably an exact contemporary of Langland, and it is on Hilton's *Mixed Life* that Chambers chiefly relies:

The three kinds of good life, as there defined by Walter Hilton, were common knowledge; Langland could not have missed them, and they are the three kinds of good life which in *Piers Plowman* are named Do-well, Do-better, and Do-best.⁸

¹ *P.M.L.A.* xlv (1929), 134-5. The passage from the *Summa Theologica* is: 'Vita contemplativa simpliciter est melior quam activa quae occupatur circa corporales actus: sed vita activa, secundum quam aliquis praedicando et docendo contemplata aliis tradit, est perfectior quam vita quae solum est contemplativa: quia talis vita praesupponit abundantiam contemplationis. Et ideo Christus talem vitam elegit' (Part III, Qu. xl, A. 1). The *Meditationes* is now attributed to a thirteenth-century Franciscan, possibly John de Caulibus; see E. Zeeman, 'Nicholas Love—A Fifteenth-Century Translator', *R.E.S.* vi (1955), 117 and references given there.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 104-6.

³ 'The Pardon', p. 322.

⁴ 'Was William Langland a Benedictine Monk?', *Mod. Lang. Quarterly*, iv (1943), 58, 60.

⁵ G. Hort, *Piers Plowman and Contemporary Religious Thought* (London, 1938), pp. 56-59.

⁶ T. P. Dunning, *Piers Plowman; An Interpretation of the A-Text* (London, 1937), p. 14.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

The date of composition of *Mixed Life* is not known. According to Miss Jones¹ the earliest manuscripts are late fourteenth century and the remainder fifteenth century. *The Scale of Perfection* recognizes two lives only, active and contemplative, and the idea of mixed life is similarly absent from *The Cloud of Unknowing* and the works of Rolle. All these were, of course, meant for an audience different from that of *Mixed Life*. Whoever read them subsequently, they were composed for recluses, not for the devout man of secular estate who (as early printed texts tell us) was addressed in *Mixed Life*.² But unless we have been particularly unfortunate in the survival of manuscripts, mixed life does not seem to have become popular in England until the end of the fourteenth century. There were the teachings of the Fathers, particularly of St. Gregory who recognized all three lives although he never called the mixed life by that name, but it seems to have needed Hilton, writing in English at the end of the fourteenth century, to bring the third life to the attention of a wider audience. Love cites him as the exponent of the idea, and presumably he is referring to *Mixed Life*:

Where of and othere vertuose exercise that longeth to contemplatyf lyuynge/ and specially to a recluse:/ and also of medled lyf/ that is to saye somtyme actyfe and somtyme contemplatyf as it longeth to dyuerse persones that in worldly astate hauen grace of goostly loue/ who so wole more pleynelly be enformed and tauzt in Englishe tonge lete hym loke the tretys that the worthy clerke and holy lyuere maister Walter hyltoun/ the chanoun of thurgartun/ wrote in englishe by grace and hize discrecioun/ and he schal fynde there/ as I leue/ a sufficient scole and a trewe of alle thise.³

Langland, however, mentions Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest as early as A ix, composed, according to the latest scholarship, in the late 1360's.⁴ In view of this, Chambers's assertion that Langland 'could not have missed' a knowledge of all three lives is probably too strong. And whereas in his earlier arguments, for example the discussion of selective or non-selective charity, Langland quotes 'authorities' to support each view,⁵ he does not quote authorities to support his definition of the three lives,⁶ as though he

¹ D. Jones, *Minor Works of Walter Hilton* (London, 1929), pp. xviii-xx.

² Jones, pp. xxii, xxvi, xxviii, xxxi.

³ *The Mirrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ . . . by Nicholas Love*, ed. L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1908), pp. 164-5.

⁴ See: O. Cargill, 'The Date of the A-text of *Piers Ploughman*', *P.M.L.A.* xlvii (1932), 354-62; B. F. Huppé, 'The A-Text of *Piers Plowman* and the Norman Wars', *ibid.* liv (1939), 37-64; J. A. W. Bennett, 'The Date of the A-text of *Piers Plowman*', *ibid.* lviii (1943), 566-72.

⁵ For Langland's use of authorities see Hort, pp. 28-43, and for the specific problem of selective or non-selective charity, E. T. Donaldson, *Piers Plowman, the C-Text and Its Poet* (London, 1949), pp. 130-4.

⁶ Except St. Paul at B xii. 30, but this is too general to be useful.

either did not know them or deliberately dispensed with them in an attempt to argue out the answer for himself. The search for a direct source, either patristic or contemporary, seems to go against Langland's own inclinations.

In discussing Hilton's view of the three lives Chambers has to admit that they do not tally exactly with Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest.¹ Hilton does not definitely place the mixed life above the contemplative life. Chambers calls this one of the 'minor differences' between Hilton's view and Langland's. I submit that the difference is important enough to make it doubtful that the two writers were dealing with the same idea. Early in his treatise, Hilton sets out the alternation between the active and the contemplative life that results in the mixed life:

Þe thredde lif þat is medled lonketh to men of holi chirche as to prelates and opere curates wheche hauyn cure and souerente ouer opere men for to kenne þem and rewle þem boþen þere bodies and principaly þere sowles in fulfellyng of þe dedys of mercy bodely and gostely. Vn to þese men it longeth sumtyme for to vse werkes of mercy in actife lyf in helpe and sustenaunce of þemselfe. and of here sogetes and of opere also. And sumtyme for to leuyn alle maner besynesses outward and 3eue þem vn to prayers and meditacioun as redyngge of holy wrytte and to opere gosteli occupaciouns after þat þei fele þem disposed. Also it longeth to summe temporal men þe wheche hauyn souerente with meche auer of werdly goodes and haue also as it were lordschepe ouer oper men for to gouerne and susteyne þem as a fader haþ ouer his children. a maister ouer his seruantes. and a lord ouer his tenauntes. þe wheche men hauen also resseyued of oure lordis gifte grace of deuocioun and in partye sauour of gostely occupacioun. Vnto þese men also longeth medled lyf þat is bothe actif and contemplatif. (f. 3r.)²

But he goes further than this. His argument is that God has placed some men in a particular worldly state which prevents them from living a fully contemplative life. It is because of the obligations of these men to those they govern—obligations of charity if seen from a religious standpoint—that they are exhorted to adopt a mixed life:

Þou schat nouth vtterly folwen þin desire for to leuen occupacioun and besynesses of þe werd qweche ben nedful to vsen in rewlyng of þin selfe and of alle opere þat ben vndyr þin kepyng and 3eue þe holly to gostly occupacioun of prayers and meditacions, as it were a frere or a monk or an oper man þat were nough bounden to þe werd be chylderen and seruantes as þou art for it falleth not to þe. and if þou dost so þou kepist nough þe ordre of charite. Also if þou woldest leuen vtterly gostly occupacioun namely now after þe grace þat god haþ 3ouen vn to þe and sette þe holly to þe besynesse of þe werd to fulfellyng of werkes of actif lyf

¹ Op. cit., p. 105.

² Quotations are from MS. Cambridge University Library Ff. 5. 40 of *Mixed Life*. Miss J. Russell-Smith, who is preparing a critical text, kindly informs me that this is the best MS. of the longer version of this treatise.

as fully as an oper man þat neuere felede deuocioun. þou leuest þe ordre of charite for þin state askep for to done bothe ilkone of þem in dyuerse tyme. þou schat medele þe werkes of actif lif with gostely werkes of lif contemplatif þanne dost þou wel. (f. 2^r.)

Hilton, if forced to an absolute order, would seem to place contemplative life highest of all:

And sothely for swich a man þat is in spirituale souereynte as prelates and curates ben or in temporel souerente as werdely lordis and maistres ben I holde þis lif best medeled and most behouely to þem as longe as þei arn bounden þer to. Bot to opere þat ben fre nouth bounden to temporal ministracioun ne to spirituale I hope þat lif contemplatife alone. if he myghte come þere to sothfastely were best most spedful. most medful. most fayr and most worthi to þem for to vsen and for to holde. (f. 4^v.)

Hence Hilton, writing for a limited class of men, of whom his 'devout man of secular estate' is one, says that absolutely contemplative life is best, but not all men who wish may follow it. Langland, in a poem meant for anyone who would read it, suggests, by his very names, an ascending order: Dowel, Dobet, Dobest. The identification of these with active, contemplative, and mixed lives is not borne out by a careful reading of *Mixed Life*.

It is time to turn to the poem itself. Langland mentions only active and contemplative lives, the mixed life never being named. At A vii. 234 (B vi. 249, not in C) he mentions both active and contemplative life but without any idea of progress from one to the other:

For Kuynde Wit wolde that vche mon wrouhte
With techinge or with tilynge or trauaylynge of hondes,
Actyf lyf or contemplatyf Crist wolde hit alse.¹

This reference Coghill dismisses by the assumption that at that stage of the poem Langland had not fully worked out the allegory of the *Vita*.² A xi. 179-84 is more serious, as it would seem to equate Dowel with active life:

'Hit is a wel lele lyf', quod heo, 'among the lewed peple,
Actif it is ihoten, hosebondes hit vsen;

¹ Quotations from *Piers Plowman* are from Skeat's Parallel Texts edition (Oxford, 1886). I assume that one author, probably called William Langland, wrote all three texts, and therefore quote from whichever text seems most relevant. In abandoning Skeat's caesural stop, I have used additional punctuation, although not to such an extent as to change the interpretation. In the above passage, Knott and Fowler, *Piers the Plowman, A Critical Edition of the A-Version* (Baltimore, 1952), place a semicolon after *contemplatyf*, thus making the third line parallel with the second. If the semicolon is placed after *hondes*, the third line (referring to the Martha-Mary story) would mean that Christ too wished all men to be engaged in some useful occupation. However it is read, the text gives no hint that the two lives are to be equated with Dowel and Dobet.

² 'The Pardon', p. 336.

Trewe tilieris on erthe, taillours and souteris,
 And alle kyne crafty men that cunne here foode wyne,
 With any trewe trauaille toille for here foode,
 Diken or deluen, Dowel it hatte.'

Thus, for Coghill, active manual labour becomes an essential part of Dowel.¹ If this was the intention of A at this point, it is noteworthy that the rest of the triad is not given. Dobet and Dobest do not signify contemplative and mixed lives, as we might expect, and this particular definition does not recur in B or C. A similar difficulty is met with in the case of Hawkyn who is actually called *Activa-Vita*:

'I am a mynstral', quod that man, 'my name is *Actiua-vita*,
 Alle ydel ich hatye, for of actyf is my name'.

Chambers, in his discussion of this part of the poem,² sees in Hawkyn 'the inferior type of Active Man as Hilton defines him—ignorant, rough, untaught, with no savour of devotion, yet with a fear of God, and good will to his fellow-Christians'; and he states that 'Hawkyn, Active Life, stands for all, from the lowest to the highest, who are too "fleshly and boisterous", too much cumbered with the world, to undertake the life of Contemplation, Poverty and Charity'. But if Hawkyn is to represent active life, even a lower type of active life, and if active life equals Dowel, it seems strange that he should be guilty of all the sins in the calendar—after all, most writers (including Hilton, and Langland as just quoted) regarded it as sufficient for salvation³—and that Hawkyn himself after his confession wishes that he 'hadde ben ded and doluen for Doweles sake' (B xiv. 321). I have sometimes thought that Langland was not using 'Activa-Vita' as a technical term here, for Hawkyn twice (B xiii. 225, 238) defines himself as 'hating idleness', a definition which seems to savour more of etymology than of mysticism, but I should not insist upon this.

Some lines found only in the C-text (viii. 299–306) are also difficult:

Thenne was ther on heichte Actif, an hosebounde he semed:
 'Ich haue ywedded a wyf', quath he, 'wel wantowen of maners;
 Were ich seuenyght fro hure syghte, synnen hue wolde,
 And loure on me and lyghtliche chide and seye ich loue anothere.
 For-thy, Peers ploughman, ich praye the telle hit Treuthe,
 Ich may nat come for a Kytte, so hue cleueth on me;

¹ 'The Pardon', p. 325.

² B xiii. 224–5. Chambers, pp. 151, 154.

³ I have changed Skeat's *feir* at A xi. 179 (read by MS. V only) to *lele* (most of the other MSS. including T). For the meaning of *lele* ('just, allowable') see Donaldson, pp. 65–66. Cf. also Skeat's misgivings about Hawkyn, 'Activa-Vita': 'The minstrel here described was very far from being an honest man, and was hardly justified in giving himself so honest a name.' (E.E.T.S. edition, iv. 313.)

Vxorem duxi, et ideo non possum uenire'.

Quath Contemplacion, 'by Crist thauh ich care suffice,
Famyn and defaute, folwen ich wolle Peers'.

Donaldson sees these lines as foreshadowing Piers's transition from Dowel to Dobet, made absolute in the Pardon Scene.¹ This raises the question of the significance of Piers's tearing of the Pardon. To suggest, with most critics,² that he renounces the active life absolutely in favour of the contemplative (even if we admit that these are the proper meanings of Dowel and Dobet) seems to me too drastic, for it implies that the first is unworthy of the good man. All men had to begin in active life, and most writers (including, incidentally, Hilton)³ are tolerant to those unable to progress farther. The Pardon is sent as a reward to Piers, and it promises that those who do well shall go to Heaven. Piers, therefore, here symbolizes Dowel, perhaps more completely than at any other point in the poem. As Frank says,⁴ it is a strange practice that makes Piers, just as his significance becomes clear, immediately pass on to represent something else.

It will have been noticed that the argument so far has been concerned principally with Dowel and Dobet. I should not object to a rough equation of Dowel with the idea of the active life, although I believe that Langland was not thinking of the technical term and that the resemblance is coincidental. The first stage in any progression must be described in general terms, and in such triads as these must refer to the majority of Christians who have no special religious calling. But if this is to be allowed, we must dismiss any idea of limiting active life to the performance of manual labour. Hilton's definition was much wider than this; it covers much of what Langland's critics usually assign to Dobet:

Be þis bodely werkyng þat I speke of may þou vnderstonde alle maner of goode werkes þat þin soule doth bi þe wyttes and þe membres of þin body vn to þin selfe as in fastyng. wakyng and in refreynyng of fleschly lustes bi oper penaunce doynge or to þin euencristene bi fulfellyng of þe dedes of mercy bodely or gostly. or vn to god be suffryng of alle maner bodely myscheues for þe luf of rythwysnes. Alle þese werkes don in trouthe be charite plesen god withoute whiche þei ben nouth. (f. 1^v.)⁵

¹ Op. cit., pp. 166-8.

² For a discussion of critical opinion, see R. W. Frank, 'The Pardon Scene in *Piers Plowman*', *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 317-31, and J. J. Lawlor, 'Piers Plowman; the Pardon Reconsidered', *M.L.R.* xlv (1950), 449-58.

³ e. g., *Scale of Perfection* (ed. G. Sitwell, London, 1953), pp. 96-98, 163-5.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 325.

⁵ Cf. *Scale of Perfection* (I quote from B.M. MS. Harley 6579): 'Also apartie of actife lif lith in grete bodili dedes. wilk aman doth to hym self. as gret fastyng. mikel wakyng. and oper scharp penaunce doynge' (f. 2^v) and the remarks of Frank, pp. 324-7.

I have already stated that I consider the idea of mixed life too limited to apply it to the idea of Dobet. The most difficult of the three equations is that of Dobet and the contemplative life.

There seems, first of all, to be some confusion of thought here, since the critics sometimes refer to Dobet as the contemplative life, sometimes as the 'clerkly life'. Obviously not all clerics were contemplatives. The difficulty lies in the question: did the practice of the contemplative life demand complete renunciation of the world and enclosure of some sort? If it did, Dobet cannot be equated with the contemplative life. If contemplation is only an occasional practice in a life otherwise passed in the world, we seem (on the evidence of the same critics) to be dealing not with Dobet but with Dobest. Abbot Butler sets out well the ambiguity in the use of the term:

'Contemplative life' has two meanings. It has an objective meaning: a manner of corporate life ordained with the primary object of facilitating and promoting the exercise of contemplation, by removal or reduction of the usual obstacles. And it has a subjective or personal meaning, according to which, whatever be the external conditions, that man is leading a contemplative life who effectively practises contemplation. In this sense, whatever be his calling or manner of life, a contemplative is leading a contemplative life: it is a matter of personal experience, not of external conditions.¹

The question of what Hilton meant by 'contemplation' is worth further investigation. Early in *The Scale of Perfection* he distinguishes three degrees of contemplation. The first is not true contemplation; it is governed by the reason and does not include any inward experience of God. The second has two stages: a lower stage which Hilton states may, by a special gift of grace, be experienced briefly in active life, and a higher stage possible only to those who, after long bodily and spiritual exercise, come to tranquillity of body and soul. The third, distinguished by the approach to perfect knowledge and love of God and completed only in Heaven, is usually reserved for the enclosed contemplative.

In Book II of *The Scale of Perfection*, Hilton seems to have abandoned these rigid definitions, though the substance of his teaching remains the same.² He never states that enclosure is absolutely necessary for the practice of contemplation. There may be many approaches to contemplation, but only one door:

Per mown be mony sundry weies. and sere werkes ledend sundry soules to contemplacioun. for after sundry disposynges of men and after sundry states. as are religious and seculers þat þei are in: are diuers exercices in wirkyng. Nerþeles þer is no gate bot on for what exercice it be þat a soule haf bot if he may come bi

¹ E. C. Butler, *Western Mysticism* (London, 1922), p. 290.

² For Hilton's different treatment of this subject in Books I and II, see Sitwell, *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 1. Cf. also *Eight Chapters* (ed. Jones, *op. cit.*), pp. 95-97.

pat exercice to pis knowynge and to a meke felynge of him self. . . . soply he is not ȝit come to reformynge in felynge ne naþ not fully contemplacioun. (f. 96^v.)

Mixed Life, however, perhaps because Hilton's later view became again more crystallized, or perhaps because in that book, meant for a secular audience, he was anxious to give clear-cut definitions, seems to demand some sort of enclosure:

Contemplatif lif a lone longeth to swiche men and wymmen þat for þe loue of god forsaken alle open synnes of þe werd and of here flesch and alle besynesses charges and gouernaunses of werdly goodes and make þem self pore and naked to þe bare nede of þe bodely kynde and fre from souereynthe of alle opere men to þe seruise of god. (f. 3^r.)

The point which seems to emerge from Hilton's teaching on this subject is that even in the lower stage of the second degree of contemplation of his earlier definition—the one most favourable to an identification of Dobet with the contemplative life—he demands enclosure of the mind, if not of the body, to an extent which Langland does not recognize. Furthermore, in Hilton's definitions of contemplation, assiduous and devout prayer is a constant feature, and, as Father Sitwell says, he seems to have visualized contemplation as a growing awareness of the life of sanctifying grace within the soul.¹ Langland, in the *Vita de Dobet*, does not stress this side of contemplation, whereas it is the predominant aspect with Hilton. Moreover, there is in Langland nothing about the 'lightsome darkness' and the 'rich nought' of *The Scale of Perfection* or of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, still less of the sensuous imagery of Rolle. The definitions of Dobet in *Piers Plowman* seem to stress practising what one preaches or helping or teaching others. 'To love friend and foe', 'to suffer', 'to suffer for the good of your soul all that the Book, by the Church's teaching, bids', 'Doce', 'Confession'—the definitions are taken from Coghill's table in *Medium Ævum*—how can these be equated with the contemplative life as defined by Hilton?

There are two further pieces of evidence which, although not proof in themselves, help to make suspect the equation of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest with active, contemplative, and mixed lives. The first was, in fact, noticed by Chambers. It is that whereas Hilton represents Christ as living the mixed life, *Piers Plowman* B xix. 104 ff. shows Christ practising Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest in turn.² The second is that the Middle Ages, drawing inspiration largely from St. Augustine and St. Gregory, had standard scriptural illustrations for the active and contemplative lives: Martha and Mary, Lia and Rachel, St. Peter and St. John, Moses's ascent of Mount

¹ Op. cit., p. xi.

² Chambers, p. 105. Huppé in *Speculum*, xxii (1947), 619, remarks on the difficulty of Christ apparently representing Dobet, an intermediate virtue.

Sinai. Such comparisons are common in medieval mystical writings. Hilton uses those of Martha and Mary and Lia and Rachel in *Mixed Life*.¹ So common was the use of the former story as an illustration of active and contemplative lives, that Pecock, who wishes to draw a rather different moral, has to justify at some length his departure from the views of 'manye holy doctouris'.² But when Langland quotes the story of Martha and Mary, he uses it, not to illustrate Christ's praise of the contemplative life above the active, but to exalt poverty:

Martha on Marye Magdeleyne an huge pleynte she made,
And to owre saueour self seyde thise wordes,
*Domine, non est tibi cure quod soror mea reliquit me solam ministrare, etc.*³
And hastiliche god answered and eytheres wille folwed,
Bothe Marthas and Maries, as Mathew bereth witness,
Ac pouerte god put bfore and preysed it the better;
*Maria optimam partem elegit, que non auferetur ab ea.*³

This seems a strange moral to draw, and stranger still for any writer who had read treatises explaining the active and contemplative lives.

The probabilities, therefore, seem to be against a direct identification of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest with active, contemplative, and mixed lives. This has been noticed before, but has not, I believe, been demonstrated in detail. Meroney, finding the triad active, contemplative, and mixed lives unsatisfactory as an explanation of the three 'lives' in *Piers Plowman*, suggested that they might be understood in terms of another triad: purgative, illuminative, and unitive lives, a triad possibly originating with St. Augustine and having been developed by pseudo-Dionysius.⁴ Meroney's article lacks the detailed illustrations from the poem which one would like to see, and appears to place too heavy a stress on the single line B xx. 212:

I comsed to rowme
Thorw Contricioun and Confessioun tyl I cam to Vnite.

The third stage of this triad seems to come rather late in the poem. It may be objected that the final stage of the mystical progress was only begun on earth and completed in Heaven. But the ending of *Piers Plowman* gives no

¹ *Mixed Life* (ed. Jones), pp. 10-11, 32-34. See also: *Ancrene Riwle* (E.E.T.S., o.s. 225), p. 189; *Cloud of Unknowing* (E.E.T.S., o.s. 218), pp. 47 ff.; *Scale of Perfection* (ed. Sitwell), p. 26; *Love, Mirrour* (ed. Powell), pp. 156-65, 174-5, 200-1.

² Pecock, *Reule of Crysten Religioun* (E.E.T.S., o.s. 171), pp. 488-93.

³ B xi. 242-6. Noticed also by Donaldson, p. 171.

⁴ H. Meroney, 'The Life and Death of Longe Wille', *ELH*, xvii (1950), 8-15. On pseudo-Dionysius see: P. Pourrat, *Christian Spirituality* (London, 1922), i. 220, n. 1, and P. Hodgson, 'Dionysius the Areopagite and Christian Mystical Tradition', *Contemporary Review*, clxxvi (1949), 281-5.

indication of this, for the final pilgrimage of Conscience in search of Piers apparently takes place on this earth.

Two critics, Father Dunning and Professor Donaldson, have considered that not one but both of the triads mentioned above might be applied to the elucidation of the poem. Dunning says that in the A-text Thought and Clergy define Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest in terms of objective states of perfection (active, contemplative, and mixed lives) whereas Wit defines them more subjectively as purgative, illuminative, and unitive states, teaching that perfection does not depend on a man's position in life but on the state of his soul¹. I believe Dunning is correct in seeing that the triad active, contemplative, and mixed lives will not fit all the definitions of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, and in stressing that the latter have to do with the individual conscience much more than with rank. But once again we get the best answer with respect to Dowel. It is roughly equivalent to purgation as it is to active life, because the rooting out of sin is as much an initial stage in a man's reformation as is living according to the Commandments. However, after Wit's first definition (A x. 76-80) Dowel does not come particularly close to the purgative state, and at the end of all his instruction the Dreamer seems as puzzled as ever:

'3et am I neuere the ner, for nou3t I have walkid,
To wyte what is Dowel witterly in herte.' (A xi. 250-1.)

And Dunning admits that in this matter the evidence from the B-text runs contrary to that from A.²

Professor Donaldson, too, believes that Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest sometimes come close to active, contemplative, and mixed lives, and sometimes to the purgative, illuminative, and unitive states:

... the *Vita* handles two basically different concepts at the same time and sometimes in the same terms. The chief difference between the concepts is that the first, as applied to the life of the individual, seems to develop in a sequence from outwardness (the active life) to inwardness (the contemplative life) to inward-outwardness (the mixed life), while the second develops in a sequence of three stages of inwardness, all of which, of course, have also appropriate outward manifestations and all of which are, incidentally, open to men of all vocations.³

He goes on to demonstrate that C's particular modification of this general idea was to emphasize Dowel as the first stage in a more subjective spiritual life. As this paper has shown, I cannot agree with the part of the argument which deals with active, contemplative, and mixed lives, but Donaldson's sensitive and thorough discussion of the metamorphosis of B into C seems essentially correct. But although I agree that C in particular contains some of St. Bernard's philosophy, I cannot agree that evidence of his mystical

¹ Op. cit., pp. 173-4, 179, 182.

² p. 191-2.

³ Op. cit., p. 159.

teaching is to be seen there also. The triad humility, charity, and unity, as set out by St. Bernard, does not seem to correspond with Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest. Donaldson himself does not appear to be completely sure of his thesis, admitting that Dobest contains little suggesting St. Bernard's idea of union with God, and resorting to a rather unsatisfactory line of argument to change St. Bernard's humility into C's 'patient poverty'.¹

But how did the Church in general view the relationship between the active, contemplative, and mixed lives and the purgative, illuminative, and unitive states? This question has fortunately been considered by Father Pepler. We have, he points out, to distinguish between an exterior station of life, fixed by rule and obligation, and an interior life of progress common to all Christians, but it is perfectly possible to fit the two together:

... there are three exterior states for a Christian to follow—the active, the mixed, and the contemplative—and these remain permanently according to his obligations. But within the interiority of his mind and heart he lives a simple Christian life which begins by being active in desire and by preference but concludes by being firmly fixed in contemplative love.²

The interior life may be seen further in terms of a progression: purgation, illumination, and unity (or, as they were sometimes called, the stages of the *incipientes*, *proficientes*, and *perfecti*). The exterior contemplative state may assist the interior life by providing circumstances favourable to contemplation, but it should not be regarded as a merit in itself, for in Heaven real reward comes as a result of the interior life and only accidental reward as a result of the exterior. The troublesome mixed life can now be seen not as a true stage of the interior life, but an exterior state. It is properly a combination of the exterior active state and the interior contemplative life. A man's interior life must be either active or contemplative. In a bishop, the stock example of the mixed life, it is contemplative, just as St. Thomas's mixed life will be seen to be more contemplative than active. But a bishop need not have reached the highest type of life, that of union with God.

These are valuable distinctions, expressing more fully what had been pointed out earlier by Abbot Butler (who was not, of course, dealing with fourteenth-century writings) and I have dealt with them at some length, since attempts to fit together one type of interior life and another external state and to label the result Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, have resulted in false criticism of *Piers Plowman*. But I cannot agree with Father Pepler when he suggests that Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest represent the three stages of the interior life, albeit in a different way from that suggested by Meroney:

Langland classed the active life in its lowest form as a purely 'natural' living

¹ Op. cit., p. 196.

² C. Pepler, 'The Divine Specialists', *Life of the Spirit*, v (1951), 395.

according to the flesh and at best as something approaching the well-meaning busy life usually described by the mystical writers as 'active'. On the other hand his three, Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, are the types of good life, supernatural rather than natural, guided by the Holy Spirit. The first stage may be to some extent identified with the better sort of active life; but on the whole all three could be regarded as contemplative in so far as they are supernatural and devoted ultimately to God. He does in fact describe three stages of the beginner, the proficient and the perfect in the devout life. This is characteristically active concerned directly with fellow human beings though based on God and the love of God. Such an active conception of the three ways was perhaps inevitable in a poem cast in so essentially social a mould.¹

Langland does not make a specific distinction between a lower and a higher level of active life, as Hilton, for example, does. Such a distinction would have to be inferred from the characterization of Hawkyng as opposed to the early Piers. But the question seems to be one of two completely different books, written by two very different men. Hilton, the Augustinian canon and director of souls seeking mystic union with God, saw and applied the distinction between active, contemplative, and mixed lives and purgative, illuminative, and unitive interior states, as Pepler notes. But Langland, the wanderer, the talker, dealing primarily with Heaven as reflected in the things of this world, does not seem to be continuously aware of the difference. Pepler, and Meroney also,² illustrate their argument by quoting C xix. 68 ff., a discussion of the fruit of the Tree of Charity (or *Ymago-dei*, to give it its proper title in C):

'Adam was as tree and we aren as hus apples, Somme of ows sothfast and some variable, Somme litel and some large, like apples of kynde. As weddede men and wedewes and ryzt worthy maidenés, The whiche the <i>Seynt Esprit</i> seweth, the sonne of al heuene, Conforteth hem in here continence that lyuen in contemplacion, As monkes and monyeles, men of holichurche; These hauen hete of the Holi Gost, as crop of treo the sonne. Wedewes and wedeweres that here owen wil forsaken And chast leden here lyf ys lyf of contemplacion, And more lykyng to oure lorde than lyue as kynde asketh, And folwe that the flesh wole and frut forth brynge, That lettered men in here langage <i>Actiua Uita</i> callen.'	70 75 80
'3e, syre', ich seide, 'and sitthen ther aren bote two lyues That oure lorde aloweth, as lered men ous techeth, That is <i>Actiua Uita</i> and <i>Uita Contemplatiua</i> , Whi groweth this frut in thre degrees?' . . .	

¹ C. Pepler, 'Langland's Way to Unity', *Life of the Spirit*, i (1947), 202-3.

² Loc. cit., pp. 14-15.

These lines are puzzling, partly because of the syntax. I believe that *The whiche* in line 72 refers only to *ryst worthy maiden*es, and that lines 72-75 are a parenthesis. But, however we read the passage, the Dreamer objects that there are three degrees of fruit, yet only two permissible ways of life. Pepler argues that Langland classes the three degrees of good life (signified here by Matrimony, Widowhood, and Virginity) all together as contemplative, and places the active life outside of this. But both he and Meroney appear to overlook the fact that this passage appears towards the end of the poem. From the beginning Langland had heard of active and contemplative (and possibly mixed) lives, but while writing the C-text, he added this passage to a poem which, as Donaldson states, already dealt to a much greater extent than B with the individual conscience. Langland came to see that these terms were not satisfactory, even as a temporary definition of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest. He was unable, that is, to carry out the sort of equation that the theories of Wells, Coghill, and Chambers logically demand of him: three degrees of fruit equal active, contemplative, and mixed lives, which in turn equal Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest. It would have been an excellent chance to make this intention clear. So, as usual, he argues out the difficulty in his poem. By so doing, he has perceived a possible ambiguity in the terms which Hilton and the mystics employed much more precisely. But he does not use the specialized terms purgation, illumination, and union to describe the interior progress of the soul. (The fact that the barn Unity is called 'holicherche on Englissh' (B xix. 325) seems to fix this as a non-technical use of the word.) Nor does the passage contain a permanent solution to the problem. If Langland was satisfied, the same solution would surely appear elsewhere, not only in the closing passus of C—unless, of course, he died, and so was unable to do more than state his difficulty. His immediate solution was to adopt a third triad: Matrimony, Widowhood, and Virginity, which at least was not ambiguous.

I have suggested that neither the triad active, contemplative, and mixed lives, nor the triad purgative, illuminative, and unitive states, nor a combination of the two is completely satisfactory as a definition of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, and that the proposed equations break down especially in the case of the second elements, that is, that Dobet equals the contemplative life or the illuminative state. There seem, therefore, to be two possible solutions to the problem. The first is that Langland had a source not yet identified for the ideas of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest. The second is that he used those names to represent a composite system, an amalgam his own mind had made from ideas which were 'in the air'; perhaps he himself had not fully assimilated these concepts, or perhaps he considered that the ordinary Christian would not follow, or would not

need, the complexities of contemporary thought. I think that we should recognize the importance of solutions of this second type in any study of the history of fourteenth-century ideas. Obviously we must first separate and understand the various systems, but having done so, we ought not to expect that the result will provide a ready-made guide to the thought of a great writer, particularly of a great poet. And, as several critics have pointed out, Langland seems to have been a talker and a listener rather than a student, either of philosophy or of mysticism. His probable way of life, and his methods of organizing and presenting his poem (with its numerous digressions) both point in this direction.¹

I consider, however, that there is a third possibility: that the ideas themselves were originally fairly simple, non-technical ones. This approach is seen in part in the criticisms of the poem by F. A. R. Carnegy and G. H. Gerould. Carnegy quotes Mensendieck to the effect that Dobet is not an ideal superior to Dowel but simply a life conducted according to the precepts of Dowel; the only man able to live Dobet fully was Christ. Hence Dobet is the foundation and perfect rule of the Church on earth, according to the example of Dowel and through the redemption of mankind by Christ (Dobet).² Gerould asks:

... is it necessary to ascribe fixed limits to those states of right living? Are not the three simply different aspects of the way of life to which any Christian may aspire, however much he may fail to reach it?³

These suggestions, however, do not fully allow for the progression inherent in the concepts of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest.

I would not deny the possibility that Langland's idea of the nature of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest underwent certain modifications as he progressed from the A-text to the B-text and from B to C, but I believe that his main ideas remained constant. I believe further that by the close of *Piers Plowman* Langland's readers have a good, though vague, idea of what Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest represent, although, like the poet, they might be hard put to it to make a comprehensive, all-inclusive definition of them in a few lines. At one point, indeed, Langland almost gives up the idea of definitions:

'And seith that Dowel and Dobet aren two infinites,
Whiche infinites, with a feith, fynden oute Dobest,
Which shall saue mannes soule', thus seith Piers the Ploughman,
'I can nouȝt her-on', quod Conscience. . . . (B. xiii. 127-30.)

¹ See Donaldson, pp. 159-60 and the references given there. For Langland's probable way of life see the final chapter of Donaldson's book.

² F. A. R. Carnegy, *The Relations between the Social and Divine Order in William Langland's 'Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman'* (Breslau, 1934), pp. 34-35, 38-39.

³ 'The Structural Integrity of *Piers Plowman*, B', *S.P.*, xlv (1948), 74.

As earlier critics have stated,¹ the various definitions in the poem are not mutually exclusive but complementary. Langland may, while feeling his way towards a solution, have tried temporary equations of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, with various triads: contrition, confession, and satisfaction; matrimony, widowhood, and virginity; or (less likely) active, contemplative, and mixed lives. But I believe that such definitions were not systematic, and that we should beware of limiting Langland's terms by equating them with titles like 'contemplative life' with their restricted meanings.

The first mention of Dowel is at the close of the Pardon Scene.² It is obviously a translation of the *qui bona egerunt* of the Pardon itself. But it has already been suggested in Holy Church's advice to the Dreamer in Passus i of the B-text:

And alle that worche with wronge wenden hij shulle
After her deth day and dwelle with that shrewe.
Ac tho that worche wel, as holiwritt telleth,
And enden as I ere seide in treuthe, that is the best,
Mowe be siker that her soule shal wende to heuene,
Ther treuthe is in Trinitee and troneth hem alle. (B i. 126-31.)

with which we may compare C xiii. 117-8:

And euery man help other for hennes shulleth we alle
To haue as we han deserued, as holychurche wittnesseth,
Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in uitam eternam; qui vero mala, in ignem eternum.

and B xix. 191-3:

And demen hem at domes daye bothe quikke and ded;
The gode to the godhede and to grete loye,
And wikke to wonye in wo withouten ende.

Thus the idea of Dowel (if not the name) is implicit throughout the poem.

Now Langland's sudden mention in Thought's speech of two further degrees, Dobet and Dobest, has puzzled several critics. But we ought not to be so surprised at this, especially when we notice that Dowel is sometimes defined alone (B ix. 107, xi. 402, xii. 30, xiii. 104, xiv. 87). This suggests that Dowel was Langland's main concern throughout the poem, and that by it he meant something like 'living a good life in whatever state you are called'. This seems to be his main message. All good men, including good bishops (who cannot signify Dobest which has not been mentioned at this point), share in Piers's Pardon. Early in the poem bishops and priests are exhorted to concentrate on the spiritual welfare of their flocks, just as knights are told that their task is to enforce efficient administration of their estates.³

¹ Coghill, *M. Æ.* ii (1933), 128; Wells, *P.M.L.A.* xlv (1929), 133 and liii (1938), 342; Dunning, p. 170; G. Kane, *Middle English Literature* (London, 1951), pp. 240-1.

² A viii. 97; B vii. 113; C x. 289.

³ A Prologue 90-95; A i. 92 ff.

The same teaching is present in the episode of the ploughing of the half-acre, and is repeated by Grace in the final stage of the poem:

'Thowgh some be clenner than somme, 3e se wel', quod Grace,
'That he that vseth the fairest crafte, to the foulest I couth haue put hym,
Thinketh alle', quod Grace, 'that grace cometh of my 3ifte;
Lok that none lakke other, but loueth alle as bretheren.' (B xix. 246-9.)

It is the Dreamer's own defence when Reason questions him:

Yf ich by laboure sholde lyue and lyfode deseruen,
That labour that ich lerned best therwith lyue ich sholde:
In eadem uocatione in qua uocati estis, manete. (C vi. 42-43.)

Once the idea of Dowel is clear, Dobet and Dobest follow naturally, not as different 'lives' or 'states' but as degrees of the same thing. To use the metaphor employed earlier in this paper, we have a simple equation with one unknown and two multiples of it, not a compound equation of three unknowns in uncertain relationship. Of course, as Imaginative told the Dreamer, there were plenty of books to teach men what Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest meant, not only books like *Mixed Life*, but much more generally, books about how to live a good life.¹ And if you live a good life, you can go on to live a better and best life, helping others as well as helping yourself, and finally accepting a measure of responsibility for their spiritual welfare. As Wit says (A x. 119-23), Dobest comes from Dowel and Dobet—the progression is a natural one.² Let us finally return to the first definition of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, that of Thought, a passage substantially the same in all three texts:

Whoso is trewe of his tonge and of his two handes,
And thorough his laboure or thorough his londe his lyfode wynneth,
And is trusti of his tailende, taketh but his owne,
And is not dronkenlew ne dedeignous, Dowel hym folweth.
Dobet doth ryzt thus, ac he doth moche more;
He is as low as a lombe and loueliche of speche,
And helpeth alle men after that hem nedeth;
The bagges and the bigurdeles he hath tobroken hem alle
That the erl Auarous helde and his heires;
And thus with Mammonaes moneie he hath made hym frendes,
And is ronne into Religioun and hath rendred the bible,
And precheth to the people seynt Poules wordes
Libenter sufferitis insipientes, cum sitis ipsi sapientes.
'And suffreth the vnwise with 3ow for to libbe',

¹ B xii. 17-19. Cf. A xi. 265-7 where information about Dowel is said to be found in the works of Solomon and Aristotle; there is no mention of contemporary works on mysticism.

² Cf. A xi. 86-91.

And with gladde wille doth hem gode, for so god 3ow hoteth.
Dobest is aboue bothe and bereth a bisschopes crosse,
Is hoked on that one ende to halie men fro helle.
A pyke is on that potente to pulte adown the wikked
That wayten any wikkednesse Dowel to tene.

(B viii. 80-97. Cf. A ix. 71-89, C xi. 78-98.)

Here it is stated that Dobet includes all that Dowel does but much more, and that Dobest is above both—not necessarily superior in rank or in mystic communion with God, but in the practice of the good life leading to salvation which I believe it was the Dreamer's (and so the poet's) chief concern to find.¹

¹ I wish to thank Professors P. Hodgson and G. Kane for their helpful discussion and criticism of the subject-matter of this article. They are not, of course, committed to the views expressed. My thanks are also due to the authorities of the British Museum and the University Library, Cambridge for permission to quote from manuscripts in their possession.

SIDNEY AND AGRIPPA

By A. C. HAMILTON

IN his *Apologie for Poetrie* Sidney offers a grammar of the arts and sciences in which poetry is given supremacy both in its nature and in its end or working. 'Of all Sciences', he argues, 'is our Poet the Monarch.' His defence of poetry is made through a powerful and witty attack upon the vanity of all other arts and sciences. Briefly, he demonstrates that unlike poetry they are limited by Nature, and that none achieves so effectively as poetry the highest end of learning. For this attack he uses the *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum et artium* of Henricus Cornelius Agrippa. Gregory Smith has noted that the objections against poetry to which Sidney replies are 'probably inspired by this work, which speaks of *architectrix mendaciorum et cultrix perversorum dogmatum*'.¹ But Agrippa's influence upon Sidney is more thorough and even formative. As I shall try to demonstrate in this essay, Sidney exploits Agrippa's argument in the *De vanitate* in order to attack all the other arts and sciences, and to establish thereby the central argument for his defence of poetry.

When Sidney considers the objections brought against poetry by the Poet-haters, he refers to Agrippa and to the final chapter of the *De vanitate* entitled 'A digression in praise of the Ass':

Wee know a playing wit can prayse the discretion of an Asse, the comfortablenes of being in debt, and the iolly commoditie of beeing sick of the plague. So of the contrary side, if we will turne *Ouids* verse, *Vt lateat virtus proximitate mali*, that good lye hid in neerenesse of the euill, *Agrippa* will be as merry in shewing the vanitie of Science as *Erasmus* was in commending of follie. Neyther shall any man or matter escape some touch of these smyling raylers.²

Then he adds an interesting and significant reservation: 'But for *Erasmus* and *Agrippa*, they had another foundation then the superficial part would promise', and turns to attack 'these other pleasant Fault-finders'.³ Evidently Sidney read Agrippa's work as something other than it appears in its surface meaning, as mere scurrilous abuse of all the arts including poetry. He took it as a work of irony whose concealed meaning was not abuse of the arts, though he does not explain what he means by 'another foundation'. His reservation suggests that it influenced him beyond its

¹ *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford, 1904), i. 393. Cf. J. W. H. Atkins, *English Literary Criticism: the Renaissance* (London, 1947), p. 123.

² *Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie*, edited by J. Churton Collins (Oxford, 1907), p. 35. This edition is cited throughout.

³ *Ibid.*

'superficial part' which he considers in answering the various objections to poetry.

That Agrippa should have influenced Sidney is reasonable to expect. His work was published in 1530 and englished in 1569, with a second edition in 1575; and when Sidney began composing the *Apologie* in 1579-80, it was popular and infamous. Marlowe's Faustus aspires to be 'as cunning as Agrippa was,/ Whose shadowes made all Europe honour him';¹ while Bacon denounces him as 'that trivial buffoon, who in reviewing the opinions of others distorts every idea in order to give it over to ridicule'.² Nashe inveighs against him as the master of those who rail at the arts, though, as McKerrow shows, the greater part of his apparent learning is transferred wholesale from Agrippa's work.³ Harington allows Agrippa to be 'a man of learning & authoritie not to be despised' but stands ready 'to condemne him for a generall libeller'.⁴ Agrippa's argument is commonplace and orthodox: that all worldly arts and sciences are uncertain and vain for knowledge comes from Satan, and that certainty and truth are to be found only in the Word of God. In these terms Gabriel Harvey praises the work:

A thousand good leaues be for euer graunted *Agrippa*.
For squibbing and declaýming against many fruitlesse
Artes, and Craftes, deuísde by the *Diuls and Sprites*, for a torment,
And for a plague to the world: as both *Pandora*, *Prometheus*,
And that cursed *good bad Tree*, can testifie at all times.⁵

It is distinguished, however, by its method; for Agrippa writes ambiguously with serious mockery and mock-seriousness, and his invective is mingled with irony. Sidney rightly calls him 'a playing wit' who can be 'merry in shewing the vanitie of Science'. His work may be read as a sceptical discourse employing cynical invective to argue that *nihil scire felicissima vita* (placed as motto on the title-page of the 1532 Cologne edition); but equally it may be read as an elaborate joke whose whole point is that 'a demi-god in omnisufficiency of knowledge, a diuell in the practise of horrible Artes' (as Gabriel Harvey calls him),⁶ can use immense knowledge to denounce the use of knowledge. His discourse upon the vanity of the arts concludes with the serious exhortation: 'it is better

¹ *Doctor Faustus*, I. i. 139-40.

² *Tempus partus masculus*. For this reference I am indebted to F. H. Anderson, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon* (Chicago, 1948), p. 110.

³ *Pierce Penilesse*, in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, edited by R. B. McKerrow (London, 1910), i. 191. McKerrow demonstrates the extent of Nashe's indebtedness to the *De vanitate* in v. 134-5.

⁴ 'A Brief Apology for Poetry' in Smith, *Eliz. Crit. Essays*, ii. 199, 200.

⁵ 'A Gallant familiar Letter' in *The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser* edited by J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt (Oxford, 1912), p. 624.

⁶ 'Pierce's Supererogation' in Smith, *Eliz. Crit. Essays*, ii. 246.

therefore and more profitable to be Idiotes, and knowe nothinge to beleue by Faithe and charitee, and to become next vnto God, then being lofty and provide through the subtilties of sciences to fall into the possession of the Serpente.¹ It concludes also with a *reductio ad absurdum* of his whole argument, a discourse upon the Mysteries of the Ass where he affirms gravely: 'it is more manifest then ye sonne, that there is no beaste so able to receiue diuinitee as the Asse, into whome if yee shall not be tourned, yee shall not be able to carrie the diuine misteries.'² The brilliance of Agrippa's method made his work a model in the literature of paradox, and Barnaby Rich in his *Allarme to Englande* (1578) writes that it is diligently studied by the young courtly gentlemen who desire 'to be curious in cauilling, propounding captious questions, thereby to shewe a singularitie of their wisedomes'.³ Sidney would be one of these young courtly gentlemen, and in Agrippa's use of paradox he found a rhetorical method for defending poetry.

Sidney begins his defence of poetry by showing that the scope of all the Sciences, except poetry, is limited by Nature. 'There is no Arte deliuered to mankinde that hath not the workes of Nature for his principall obiect, without which they could not consist, and on which they so depend, as they become Actors and Players, as it were, of what Nature will have set forth.' Then he lists the various sciences to show how they are 'tied to . . . such subiection'.⁴ Since Nature's world, being fallen, is 'brasen', all these arts and sciences must err when they seek to affirm knowledge: 'the Astronomer, with his cosen the Geometrician, can hardly escape [being a liar], when they take vpon them to measure the height of the starres. . . . And no lesse of the rest, which take vpon them to affirme.'⁵ He cites the Historian who 'affirming many things, can, in the cloudy knowledge of mankinde, hardly escape from many lyes'; therefore those who look for truth in History 'goe away full fraught with falshood'.⁶ The same argument is made by Agrippa who claims that Truth cannot be

¹ *Of the Vanitie and Vncertaintie of Artes and Sciences*, Englished by Ja.[mes]San.[ford] (London, 1569), p. 183^v. Since this translation was available to Sidney I have used it throughout this essay; but there were several Latin editions, and Sidney need not have depended upon the translation. For the Latin text I have consulted the edition printed at The Hague, 1662.

² *Ibid.*, p. 185^r.

³ See *The British Bibliographer*, by Sir Egerton Brydges (London, 1810), i. 510. Sanford, Agrippa's translator, writes in his address to the Reader: ' . . . his intent is, not to deface the worthinesse of Artes and Sciences, but to reprove and detecte their euil vses, and declare the excellencie of his wit in disprouinge them, for a shewe of Learning' (*Van.* iii.). L. I. Bredvold writes of the *De vanitate*: 'Its importance lies chiefly in that it was regarded by its later readers as an addition to the literature of paradox, a literary genre which frequently became a vehicle for skeptical thought and added to the spicy flavour of the modern skeptics, from Montaigne down.' (*The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden* (Ann Arbor, 1934), p. 29.)

⁴ *Apol.*, pp. 7, 8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

apprehended by Science; and he cites with approval the academic philosophers who were in high esteem for saying 'that nothinge might be affirmed'.¹ He too cites the Astronomer who must lie because 'there is no Astronomer come downe from Heauen that hath benne able to teache the true, and certaine mouinge of the thinges that are thought not to moue'; and writes of the Historian that 'it is impossible, but that a number of them shoulde be verie Liers'.² Both Sidney and Agrippa agree in attacking the uncertainty of the arts and sciences which offer only falsehood in seeking to affirm fact. But for both the major charge against the arts and sciences is their vanity, for they do not bring self-knowledge. Agrippa tells the common story of the Astronomer who 'wente out of his house to beholde ye starres, and . . . fell into a dicke', and Sidney repeats it: 'it was found that the Astronomer looking to the starres might fall into a ditch'.³ 'The Arithmeticians, and the Geometricians number and measure al thinges', Agrippa writes, 'but they make no accompte of the numbers and measures of soule and life'.⁴ Sidney makes a similar charge: 'the Mathematician might draw forth a straight line with a crooked hart'.⁵ Of Philosophers, Agrippa says that they 'searche out the causes and the beginninges of thinges, but God the Creatour of all thinges they neglect and know not'; Sidney says that 'the enquiring Philosopher might be blinde in himselfe'.⁶ Behind this charge is their common assumption that the end of knowledge should be, in Sidney's words, 'the knowledge of a mans selfe'.⁷ Thus Agrippa urges the reader: 'if ye desire to attaine to this diuine and true wisdom not of ye tree of the knowledge of good and ill, but of the tree of life, the traditions of men set aparte, and euery search and discourse of the flesh and blood . . . now entring not into ye scholes of Philosophers and Sophisters, but into your selues, ye shal knowe all thinges'.⁸ Agrippa describes his work as a Herculean attempt 'to chalenge into the fiede all theese moste hardie hunters of Artes and Sciences';⁹ the same may be said of Sidney's opening defence of poetry where he shows himself to be, as he describes Agrippa, 'a playing wit' who can be 'merry in shewing the vanitie of Science'.

¹ *Van.*, p. 4^v.² *Ibid.*, pp. 43^r, 14^r.³ *Ibid.*, pp. 43^v-44^r; *Apol.*, p. 13.⁴ *Van.*, p. 179^v.⁵ *Apol.*, p. 13.

⁶ *Van.*, p. 179^v. This distrust of learning shared by Agrippa and Sidney is, of course, traditional. Thus compare De Mornay's *A Discourse of Life and Death*, translated by the Countess of Pembroke, 1592, where he writes of 'knowledges and learnings': 'Another by Geometry can measure fields, and townes, and countries: but can not measure himselfe. . . . The Astrologer looks vp on high, and fallies in the next ditch: fore-knowes the future, and foregoes the present: hath often his eie on the heauens, his heart long before buried in the earth. The Philosopher discourseth of the nature of all other things: and knowes not himselfe' (sig. C4^r). De Mornay makes this attack upon learning in the course of arguing the paradox: 'what euill is there not in life? and what good is there not in death?' (Sig. A3^r).

⁷ *Apol.*, p. 13.⁸ *Van.*, p. 186^r.⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. A1.

Sidney's attack upon the other arts and sciences is the basis for his defence of the nature of poetry and of its end or working. His major defence of poetry is that, unlike the arts and sciences which are 'deliuered to mankinde'—delivered, that is, by Satan—and in subjection to brazen nature, the poet creates another nature: 'the Poets only deliuer a golden.'¹ The right poets 'borrow nothing of what is, hath been, or shall be' for 'all onely proceedeth from their wit, being indeede makers of themselues, not takers of others'.² He offers fiction and not fact; therefore he 'nothing affirms'.³ By this argument Sidney counters Agrippa's main charge in affirming the uncertainty of arts and sciences, that nothing can be affirmed. Agrippa's foundation for this charge is that the senses cannot reveal truth: 'the waie of the truth is shutte vp from the senses.'⁴ But Sidney shows that in his fiction the poet offers the Idea in his mind and not the thing given to his senses. 'That the Poet hath that *Idea* is manifest', he declares. 'by deliuering them forth in such excellencie as hee hath imagined them.'⁵ At one point Agrippa allows that the writer may seek to escape the tyranny of fact:

There be moreouer many, whiche write Histories, not so mutche to tell the Truthe, as to delite that thei maie expresse, and depainte, the Image of a noble Prince, in whom they please. Whiche if any shall reprove for linyge, they saie, that they haue not so greate a regarde, to thinges done, as to the profite of the posteritee, and to the fame of witte, and therefore they haue not declared all thinges, as they haue benne donne, but how they ought to be declared, and that obstinately, they will not defende the truthe, but where the common vtillitee dothe require, either a faininge or vntruthe . . . Such an example hath *Xenophon* sette out of *Cyrus*, not as it was, but as it ought to be, as a resemblance and patterne, of a singular good Prince.⁶

Sidney exploits this argument in order to defend the art of the poet who is not, like the Historian and the rest, 'captiued to the trueth of a foolish world'.⁷ 'If the question be for your owne vse and learning', Sidney asks, 'whether it be better to haue it set downe as it should be, or as it was, then certainly is more doctrinable the fained *Cyrus* in *Xenophon* then the true *Cyrus* in *Iustin*.' Therefore the poet portrays 'so right a Prince as *Xenophons Cyrus*' to show us 'each thing to be followed; where the Historian, bound to tell things as things were, cannot be liberall (without hee will be poetically) of a perfect patterne'. Sidney concludes that '*Xenophon*, who did imitate so excellently as to giue vs *effigiem iusti imperii*, the portraiture of a iust Empire vnder the name of *Cyrus* (as *Cicero* sayth of him), made therein an absolute heroicall Poem'.⁸ While Agrippa argues that the poet seeks 'to make a clattering noise with the craftie couering of

¹ *Apol.*, p. 8.² *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 48.³ *Ibid.*, p. 38.⁴ *Van.*, p. 21^v.⁵ *Apol.*, p. 9.⁶ *Van.*, p. 16^f.⁷ *Apol.*, p. 23.⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 8, 21, 12.

fables, and disceitefullie to devise all things vpon a matter of nothinge, as *Campanus* wrote in a certain place', Sidney defends the poet's 'deliuering forth' of the Idea as 'not wholie imaginatiue, as we are wont to say by them that build Castles in the ayre: but so farre substantially it worketh, not onely to make a *Cyrus* . . . but to bestow a *Cyrus* vpon the worlde, to make many *Cyrus*'s'.¹ This argument brings Sidney to his final defence of poetry which rests upon its end or working. Above all the arts and sciences, poetry achieves the highest end of knowledge which is 'the knowledge of a mans selfe', and upon this tropological level best fulfils that final end of learning which is 'to lead and draw vs to as high a perfection as our degenerate soules, made worse by theyr clayey lodgings, can be capable of'.² It follows that poetry guides man on the way to salvation: 'of all Sciences . . . is our Poet the Monarch. For he dooth not only show the way, but giueth so sweete a prospect into the way, as will intice any man to enter into it.'³ Agrippa's charge that the knowledge brought by the arts and sciences 'hath extinguished the light of Faith, castinge our Soules into blinde darknesse: which condemninge the trueth, hath placed errours in the hiest throne'⁴ is thus countered by Sidney's claim that the knowledge brought by poetry reinforces the Word of God.

Agrippa's argument in the *De vanitate* provides a framework within which Sidney attacks the vanity of the arts and sciences and defends the art of poetry. It is fitting that he should make paradoxical use of Agrippa: he begins his *Apologie* by attacking all the arts and sciences which offer man the knowledge of good and evil, and concludes with praise of poetry because it can 'giue vs all knowledge'.⁵ Though he attacks the arts that are subject to fallen nature, he shows how they support poetry. Yet Sidney recognized that only the 'superficiall part' of the *De vanitate* is an abuse of learning. It has 'another foundation' by which he understands, most probably, that it is an abuse of the learned who use learning to deprive men of Christian liberty. 'What a wicked Tyrannie it is', Agrippa concludes in his Preface to the Reader, 'to bynde the wittes of Studentes to certaine appointed Authours, and to take from Schollers, the libertie to searche and trace out Trueth.' The end or working of his attack upon the learned is to replace the knowledge of good and evil which belongs to man's fallen estate with the unfallen state of vision. He exhorts his reader: The knowledge of all things is compacte in you. . . . As he [God] than hath created trees ful of fruites, so also hath he created the soules as reasonable trees

¹ *Van.*, p. 12^v; *Apol.*, p. 9. It is curious that the translator of the 1684 edition of the *De vanitate* echoes Sidney's words in this passage on the poets who are 'always building Castles in the Air, as *Campanus* hath truly said of them' (p. 24) (my italics). The Latin reads: '*super fumo machinari omnia, sicuti alicubi cecinit Campanus*' (1662 edn.).

² *Apol.*, p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁴ *Van.*, p. 4^r.

⁵ *Apol.*, p. 62.

full of formes and knowledges, but thorow the sinne of the first parent al things were reueled [*velata*, concealed], and obliuion the mother of ignoraunce stept in. Set you than now aside, which may, the veyle of your vnderstanding, which are wrapped in the darknes of ignoraunce. Cast out ye drinke of *Lethe* you whiche haue made you selves droncken with forgetfulnes, awaite for the true light you which haue suffered you selues to be taken with vnreasonable sleepe, and forthwith when your face is discovered ye shall passe from the light to the light.¹

Similarly, besides the 'superficial part' which is a witty attack upon the arts and sciences and a rhetorical defence of poetry there is 'another foundation' to Sidney's argument. Like Agrippa, he seeks to replace knowledge with vision. He defends the poet on grounds that he 'neuer maketh any circles about your imagination, to coniure you to beleue for true what he writes'; but instead delivers 'pictures what should be' which are 'things not affirmatiuely but allegorically and figuratiuelie written'.² Sidney sees the nature of poetry in the image which brings together the philosopher's precept and the historian's example, and its end or working achieved through the power of the image to move men to their salvation. The poetic image 'dooth strike, pierce, [and] possesse the sight of the soule',³ thereby freeing the reader, as the poet is freed, from subjection to the fallen world of the knowledge of good and evil and substituting a vision of the golden world of things as they should be.

¹ *Van.*, p. 186^r.

² *Apol.*, p. 39.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

SIR WALTER SCOTT AS BALLAD EDITOR

By WILLIAM MONTGOMERIE

THE three balladists of greatest historical significance among English-speaking people are Bishop Percy, Sir Walter Scott, and Professor F. J. Child. All three were editors basing their printed work primarily on ballad manuscripts. Percy and Child did no field work in oral tradition, and the case of Scott needs to be reconsidered.

Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765) is an English classic whose historical influence was scarcely, if at all, affected by Joseph Ritson's perfectly justified attacks on its accuracy.¹ Comparison of the *Reliques* with the original manuscript used by Percy for his fabrications proves Ritson to have been right.² Yet had Percy as editor been as accurate as Child in printing his manuscript, and Ritson's criticisms remained unwritten, the *Reliques* would still suffer from a fatal flaw, that the ballads in the book are two removes from oral tradition.

It is the central flaw in Child's collection, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (Boston and New York, 1882-98), that for him, as for Percy, the ballads were manuscript records. For both these men the ballad manuscript seemed to be primary and not, as it actually is, secondary. The manuscript of a known author who has written down his own composition is primary, but for a ballad oral tradition is primary and the manuscript is secondary.³ Between oral tradition and the secondary manuscript, a number of flaws may have distorted the primary ballad. The nature of such flaws will be considered when Sir Walter Scott's treatment of oral tradition is discussed.

First-hand knowledge of oral tradition is desirable in a ballad editor. The majority of manuscripts used by Child were fatally incomplete, and this incompleteness can be recognized only by someone familiar with oral tradition. The dilemma is described by Child himself in a letter to Svend Grundtvig:⁴

I have been able only to do such correspondence as was necessary to secure two or three manuscripts that I had heard of—none of first-rate importance—

¹ Beginning in *Remarks, critical and illustrative, on the Text and Notes of the last Edition of Shakespeare* (1783), and continuing for twenty years.

² J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall, *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*, 4 vols. (London, 1867-8).

³ A small number of ballad variants may be derived directly or indirectly from printed sources. Normally, this applies to words only.

⁴ S. B. Hustvedt, *Ballad Books and Ballad Men* (Harvard, 1930), p. 274. Letter dated 15 March 1877.

and to induce certain persons in or near Aberdeen to exert themselves to collect the ballads, which are still preserved in memory there. I hoped to find *good* copies of some of the ballads put forth by Buchan. Hitherto, owing to the sluggishness of the people I have addressed—or ought I to say to their not being able to give up their time to the business of collection!—I have not made much progress in Aberdeenshire, but I am expecting a newly made acquaintance, from the very heart of that region, to go out to Scotland this year—a man who says that his own mother has more than a hundred ballads in her memory—and he has promised his services.

The greatest collector of Aberdeenshire ballads—indeed of British ballads—was Gavin Greig,¹ after Child was dead. From oral tradition Greig recorded words and airs, with many variants, for 108 out of the 305 ballads numbered by Child. Comparison of Greig's recordings from oral tradition with Child's ballads from manuscripts suggests that the Greig ballad with music is much more the real ballad, and that the Child ballad is only the poetic half of it.

Claims have been made for Scott as a collector, in direct contact with oral tradition, but more has been claimed than is justified by the evidence. There are references to Scott's ten raids into Liddesdale between 1792 and 1801, the first seven of them (till 1798) in the company of Robert Shortreed, who has left his report² on the raids:

J.E.S. 'And how did Sir Walter obtain all the Liddesdale ballads? Was it from recitation or how?'

Father. 'Not one o' them was got from recitation, but the "Fray o' Suport". Dr Elliot of Cleugh-head had a great turn for that kind o' lore himsel, and had collected a vast deal o' the old Ballads o' the Country for his own amusement, and when Sir Walter came in quest o' that kind o' thing he got all that the Doctor then had collected, and seeing his great fondness for them, the Doctor was induced to exert himself in gathering a great many more. I think with the exception o' the "Fray o' Suport"³ (and he had an imperfect set of it too) and a very few that had been printed before in the *Hawick Museum* they war all gotten in MS. from Dr Elliot.'

The conclusion to be drawn from this, and all other available evidence,

¹ *Folk-Song of the North-East*, 2 vols. (Peterhead, 1914); Alexander Keith, *Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads and Ballad Airs Collected in Aberdeenshire by the Late Gavin Greig* (Aberdeen, 1925).

² W. E. Wilson, 'Robert Shortreed's Account of his Visits to Liddesdale with Sir Walter Scott', *Transactions of the Hawick Archaeological Society*, Session 1932 (Hawick, 1932), 58. Reprinted from *Cornhill Magazine* (Sept. 1932), pp. 54-63.

³ See *Collection of Ballads*, &c., in MS. in Abbotsford Library, Press L, Shelf II. In this MS., in Scott's handwriting, there are two variants of 'The Fray of Suport' (Nos. 2 and 5) and copies of 'John o' Cockie law' (No. 3) and of 'John the little Scot' (No. 4). After examining all the available MSS. from Scott's collections of ballads I can only report that, apart from these four, there seem to be no other ballads in Scott's hand, apart from the few in his letters. This is consistent with all the other evidence.

is that Scott was editor rather than collector, and the sources of his material in the *Minstrelsy*, as elsewhere, were in most cases manuscripts, the best known of them being those of David Herd, Robert Riddell, the Old Lady, Mrs. Brown, Thomas Wilkie, James Nicol, and Dr. Elliot. These manuscript ballads were secondary sources, and were seldom complete in their information about the nature of the ballads in oral tradition.

'What business carried you so *often* into Liddesdale?', J. E. Shortreed asked his father, and the essence of his reply is in the sentence beginning, 'There's nae doubt that baith the Country and its peculiar manners sat for their pictures at that time, . . .' (p. 61). In other words, Scott was collecting material which was later used in his novels.

The notched sticks, mentioned by Robert Shortreed, were not used by Scott to remind him of the words of ballads. A careful reading of J. E. Shortreed's report disposes of that legend. These notched sticks were the only memoranda Robert Shortreed ever saw him take or have 'of any of the memorable spots he wished to preserve the recollection of, or any tradition connected wi' them' (p. 62). When Scott consulted them during his preparation of the *Minstrelsy*, it must have been for use in the notes, not the text. When all the ballads from other collectors' manuscripts are subtracted, there are very few left that could have come from Scott's memory or his notched sticks, and one sentence of Robert Shortreed's disposes of the suspicion of undiscovered manuscripts of ballads written out by Scott in Liddesdale:

I never saw a pen in his hand nor a piece o' paper a' the times we were in Liddesdale thegither, or in any other o' our Border rides, but twice, and that was when he took the two sketches that he made o' Hermitage Castle; and the one sheet o' paper he got frae Dr Elliot, the other frae Willie o' Millburn. (p. 62.)

Before dealing with the question of the nature of ballads in oral tradition, we must examine the use of the word *recitation* about the year 1800. James Hogg, in his *Domestic Manners of Sir Walter Scott*,¹ wrote:

Scott desired me to sing them my ballad of 'Gilman's-cleuch' . . . I began it, at his request, but at the eighth or ninth stanza I stuck in it, and could not get on with another verse, on which he began it again and recited it every word from beginning to end.

This transition from Hogg's singing to Scott's recitation is accepted by Hogg without comment, though it had been composed—as was Hogg's custom—to music. Had Scott recited the poem on a later occasion, would he have taken the trouble to explain that the 'ballad' had originally been sung? He did not do so in the case of *The Fray of Suport*.

Thomas Wilkie's manuscript notebook, incorporated in Scott's 'Scotch

¹ Ed. J. E. H. Thomson (Stirling, 1909), pp. 58-59.

Ballads, Materials for Border Minstrelsy',¹ is most enlightening about the meaning of *recitation*. I shall list five significant notes from this manuscript, four of them referring to ballads:

1. *Willie Wood* (No. 61)

Taken down from the recitation of Mary Hall Gattonside . . . a great favourite of the late [deleted] and the one he always sang, when he was asked to amuse the company with his musical notes—

2. *The Laird of Gigh or Gae* (No. 64 [Child 209D, 'Geordie'])

I took this down from the recitation of Janet Scott Bowden who sung it to a beautiful plaintive old air.

3. *The Gaberlunzie Man* (No. 69 [Child 279 Appendix])

Taken down from the recitation of Alex^r Black; servant to the Laird of Caverse—almost every old person in Roxburghshire sings this song.

4. *Lady Margery* (No. 71 [Child 65J, vol. iv, p. 466, 'Lady Maisry'])

I took this down from the recitation of Janet Scott Bowden, who sang a dismal air as she called it to the words.

5. *Song my Lady ye shall be* (No. 72 [Child 290A, 'The Wylie Wife of the Hie Toun Hie'])

I took this down from the recitation of a friend, . . . The air she sung to it was lively, simple & at the same time to the musical ear, was superior to any of the olden Scottish airs—

It is clear from these five examples, and from Robert Shortreed's words, quoted above, that *recitation* did not refer exclusively to poems without music recited in the modern way as verse. There seems to be no evidence of such a ballad verse-tradition, but there is evidence of something else that may have given rise to belief in such a tradition.

The use of the word *recitation* may have been suggested by the manner in which ballads are sung. Traditional singers in Scotland are unaccompanied, and the words are of first importance. The primacy of the words may suggest the term recitation, especially if the singing is poor, breaking down into what is sometimes described as chanting, or almost to recitation in the modern sense—a phenomenon familiar in contemporary music-hall song.

A second source of misinterpretation could be in the very nature of recording with pen and paper. If the recorder of a ballad had to write down the words it would be easier to write them from recitation, not because that was the customary way of repeating a ballad, but for the temporary convenience of the copyist. If, as was usually the case, he

¹ MS. 877, National Library, Edinburgh.

omitted the air of the ballad through lack of musical knowledge, what he had written was a poem from recitation. This does not prove that in oral tradition the ballad was normally repeated as a poem.

There is an oral tradition of rhymed proverbs, folk-rhymes, and verse composed for recitation, none of which is sung, but ballads are not in the same category. The traditional ballads are a special type of folk-song seldom, if ever, distinguished by traditional singers from other types of song.¹ The justifiable distinction between narrative ballads and lyrical songs was made in comparatively recent times by collectors and editors, but the further distinction between traditionally recited ballads and folk song that is sung is not in oral tradition.

Scott himself does not always distinguish ballads from songs. In a letter to Percy (6 Oct. 1800) he wrote:

The songs [in the *Minstrelsy*] are divided into two classes namely the *Riding Ballads* (as they are called) relating to the forays & predatory incursions made upon the Borders & the Romantic or popular Ballads founded upon circumstances entirely imaginary.²

The false conception of recited ballads seems to be derived mainly from two sources: from Percy who printed his ballads from a manuscript without music, and from Scott who, in his *Minstrelsy*, printed no music from either manuscripts or oral tradition, though he knew of its existence in both. He did not conceal his lack of musical knowledge, the most detailed admission being in his *Journal*:

I do not know and cannot utter a note of music; and complicated harmonies seem to me a babble of confused though pleasing sounds. Yet songs and simple melodies, especially if connected with words and ideas, have as much effect on me as on most people. (20 Nov. 1825)

Scott accepted his limitations, and made no attempt to enlist the collaboration of a musician in the *Minstrelsy*. He rationalized his position by assuming that the air of a ballad is something outside or added to the ballad, and that each ballad he printed was complete in itself without music. He had Percy's *Reliques* as a precedent.

Child, though he printed airs for forty-six ballads, belongs rather to the century of Scott's *Minstrelsy* than to the present one. Gavin Greig in Scotland has restored airs to many of the ballads, and similar work has been done in England and America. The modern recording machine has given us further material confirming his findings. Arising out of this

¹ This conclusion is based on the writer's personal knowledge of folk-singers, confirmed by the experience of other collectors.

² *N. & Q.* clxv (1933), 308.

development is the study of ballad rhythm,¹ which goes far to prove that ballad rhythm is fundamentally musical, and that the ballad form can best be explained on the assumption that ballads were composed for singing. It is the imitation ballad or the traditional ballad 'improved' for printing which is untraditional in its rhythm.

But this is a rediscovery. James Hogg's mother said the same thing to Scott, in criticism of his *Minstrelsy*:

... But mair nor that, exceptin' George Warton an' James Stewart, there war never ane o' my sangs prentit till ye prentit them yoursel', an' ye hae spoilt them awthegither. They were made for singin' an' no for readin'; but ye hae broken the charm noo, an' they'll never [be] sung mair. An' the worst thing of a', they're nouthier richt spell'd nor richt setten down.

'Take ye that, Mr. Scott', said Laidlaw.²

Hogg seems to hold Scott responsible for the decline of ballad-singing on the Borders. He continues:

... My mother has been too true a prophetess, for from that day to this, these songs, which were the amusement of every winter evening, have never been sung more.

He was well within the oral tradition himself, and his mother entirely within it. Their evidence carries at least equal weight with that of collectors, editors, and others outside the tradition.

¹ J. W. Hendren, *A Study of Ballad Rhythm with special reference to ballad music* (Princeton, 1936).

² Hogg, *Domestic Manners*, p. 53.

THE ART OF FICTION IN GEORGE ELIOT'S REVIEWS

By JAMES D. RUST

DURING the five years immediately preceding her appearance as a novelist, from January 1852 to January 1857, George Eliot was a professional reviewer of books. For approximately three years of that time she was sub-editor of one of the more important journals of England, the *Westminster Review*. She read and reviewed, sometimes hurriedly, sometimes thoughtfully, several hundred books, ranging from theology, history, and philosophy to drama, poetry, essays, and novels.

These reviews are significant because they represent the critical apprenticeship of a celebrated artist, and embody her theory of the art which she was shortly to practise so successfully. I present here a concise analysis of that theory, making no attempt to determine whether she herself later observed these principles.

Her artistic credo may be summarized in four theses: (1) Art's greatest benefit to men is to widen their sympathies. (2) Art has a moral mission; it must develop moral and spiritual as well as sensuous beauty. (3) Art must minister morality through pleasure, not pain. (4) Art can fulfil its moral and aesthetic purposes only if it tells the truth about life, only if it presents life realistically.

'Art's greatest benefit to men is to widen their sympathies.' This idea, so typical of George Eliot's character and philosophy, recurs throughout all her critical and creative writing. Nowhere, however, is it more clearly stated than in a long article on two books by W. H. Riehl,¹ where she contrasts the conventional, idyllic pictures of country life given by painters and writers with the real thing as she has observed and lived it. The heart of her comment is in the following passage:

But our social novels profess to represent the people as they are, and the unreality of their representations is a grave evil. The greatest benefit we owe to the artist, whether painter, poet, or novelist, is the extension of our sympathies. Appeals founded on generalizations and statistics require a sympathy ready-made, a moral sentiment already in activity; but a picture of human life such as a great artist can give, surprises even the trivial and the selfish into that attention to what is apart from themselves, which may be called the raw material of moral sentiment. When Scott takes us into Luckie Mucklebackit's cottage, or tells

¹ 'The Natural History of German Life', *Westminster Review*, lxvi (July 1856), 51-79. References in the following notes are to the *Westminster Review* unless otherwise identified.

the story of 'The Two Drovers,'—when Wordsworth sings to us the reverie of 'Poor Susan,'—when Kingsley shows us Alton Locke gazing yearningly over the gate which leads from the highway into the first wood he ever saw,—when Hornung paints a group of chimney-sweepers,—more is done towards linking the higher classes with the lower, towards obliterating the vulgarity of exclusiveness, than by hundreds of sermons and philosophical dissertations.¹

'Art has a moral mission to perform.' George Eliot's reviews are filled with variations of this idea, showing how this novel or that succeeds or fails in this prime essential of the art of fiction. One of the clearest statements occurs in her review of Ruskin's *Modern Painters*:

The fundamental principles of all just thought and beautiful action or creation are the same, and in making clear to ourselves what is best and noblest in art, we are making clear to ourselves what is best and noblest in morals; . . .²

In a notable review of Hawthorne's *The Blithedale Romance*, written almost four years earlier, she had already made the significant juxtaposition of sensuous and moral beauty as two essential attributes of art: 'The object of art is the development of beauty—not merely sensuous beauty, but moral and spiritual beauty.'³

The exposition of the third article of George Eliot's creed, 'Art must minister through pleasure, not pain', is also found in her review of *The Blithedale Romance*. Here she objects to Hawthorne's intensive analysis of his characters, and thinks him deficient in 'moral depth and earnestness'. Though he has a 'rich perception of the beautiful', his moral faculty is weak and morbid; consequently the picture of life he presents is depressing and painful. After analysing and stating objections to his morbidity, she points out that

the ministry [of art] should be one of pleasure, not of pain; but our anatomist, who removes his subjects to Blithedale, that he may cut and hack at them without interference, clears out for himself a new path in art, by developing the beauty of deformity! He would give you the poetry of the hospital, or the poetry of the dissecting-room; but we would rather not have it. Art has a moral purpose to fulfil; its mission is one of mercy, not of misery.⁴

In the fourth and last point of her creed she states in clear and unmistakable terms the fundamental principle of her own realism. Again and again she objects to 'unrealistic' novels whose characters do not behave or speak like real people, and whose problems are not those of real

¹ lxvi (July 1856), 54. A better-known expression of these ideas appears in *Adam Bede*, Book Second, Chap. xvii, 'In Which the Story Pauses a Little'. There, in her tribute to the realistic Dutch painters of ordinary, homely men and women in commonplace interiors, she restates, with an infusion of characteristic irony, the point made in this early review.

² lxx (April 1856), 626.

³ lviii (October 1852), 594.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 594-5.

life. In the review of *Modern Painters* referred to above, she defines realism as

the doctrine that all truth and beauty are to be attained by a humble and faithful study of nature, and not by substituting vague forms, bred by imagination on the mists of feeling, in place of definite, substantial reality. The thorough acceptance of this doctrine would remould our life; . . .¹

A realistic picture, therefore, is the true one. The artist is especially obliged to exercise great care in writing or painting the life of ordinary people, lest he violate veracity:

Art is the nearest thing to life; it is a mode of amplifying experience and extending our contact with our fellow-men beyond the bounds of our personal lot. All the more sacred is the task of the artist when he undertakes to paint the life of the People. Falsification here is far more pernicious than in the more artificial aspects of life. It is not so very serious that we should have false ideas about evanescent fashions—about the manners and conversation of beaux and duchesses; but it *is* serious that our sympathy with the perennial joys and struggles, the toil, the tragedy, and the humour in the life of our more heavily-laden fellow-men, should be perverted, and turned towards a false object instead of the true one.²

One illustration of George Eliot's belief in realism is her charge that Dickens is guilty of psychological unreality in his depiction of characters. She says,

We have one great novelist who is gifted with the utmost power of rendering the external traits of our town population; and if he could give us their psychological character—their conceptions of life, and their emotions—with the same truth as their idiom and manners, his books would be the greatest contribution Art has ever made to the awakening of social sympathies.³

Hawthorne also violates reality by his constant morbidity:

Hawthorne walks abroad always at night, and at best it is a moonlight glimmering which you catch of reality. He lives in the region and shadow of death, and never sees the deep glow of moral health anywhere.⁴

The death of Zenobia in *The Blithedale Romance* George Eliot protests against as 'an outrage upon the decorum of art, as well as a violation of its purpose'. Emphasizing what that purpose is and why she objects to Hawthorne's treatment of Zenobia, she continues:

That such things do happen, is no reason why they should be idealized; for the Ideal seeks not to imitate Reality, but to perfect it. The use which it makes of that which *is* true, is to develope that which *ought* to be true; and it ought *never*

¹ lxv (April 1856), 626.

² lxvi (July 1856), 54. Note also her emphasis on the necessity for realism and social responsibility, *supra*, p. 165, n. 1. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 55. ⁴ lviii (October 1852), 594.

to be true that the strong should be conquered by the weak, as Zenobia was by Priscilla; or, that the most buoyant spirit should sink soonest in the struggle of life, as did Zenobia, . . . or, that *all* should be wrecked that sail on troubled waters, as were all who figure in this romance.¹

This passage expresses the essence of George Eliot's beliefs, combining her interest in ethical teaching and in realism. Hence arises the question why exact factual detail should result, not in further and better realism, but in a violation of it. This question she answers by indicating that true realism is only a means to an end, not an end in itself. It is this idea which binds together her critical theory. More significant than a photographically realistic picture is a picture that is true but designed to widen men's sympathies, to produce both sensuous and moral beauty, and to perform its creator's moral mission. Hawthorne does not accomplish this task, nor does Dickens; their realism is merely external, merely photographic.

Hence the next point: she realized the danger inherent in her insistence upon the moral purpose of art. She was well aware that the novelist might easily make his moral so emphatic as to destroy the artistry of his creation. Hawthorne, she believed, fell into this error in *The Blithedale Romance*, and simply superimposed a 'lesson' on his novel, one that has neither deep taproots in the book, nor more than an analogical relation to its materials. She points out what may be learned from the portraits of Priscilla, Zenobia, Hollingsworth, and Coverdale:

There is something very unartistic in such formal applications of moral or social truths, reminding us of the old homiletic fashion of making a 'practical improvement' of a discourse to saints, sinners, and all sorts of folk. It indicates imperfection in the construction and colouring of the picture. So many morals—one a-piece for Coverdale and Hollingsworth, and two and a-half for Zenobia—are symptomatic of weak moral power, arising from feebleness of moral purpose.²

The principal pitfall which the artist in fiction must avoid in carrying out his moral mission, George Eliot thinks, is didacticism. Sermons, no matter how effective in the pulpit, are out of place in the novel. Kingsley, for example, she considers an offender: with all his vivid description and vigorous action in *Westward Ho!* he made the mistake of preaching. 'No doubt the villain is to be hated, and the hero loved', she says, 'but we ought to see that sufficiently in the figures of them. We don't want a man with a wand, going about the gallery and haranguing us. Art is art, and tells its own story.'³

Worse than *Westward Ho!*, however, is Miss Jewsbury's *Constance Herbert*, a novel written to prove that 'nothing . . . renounce[d] for the

¹ lviii (October 1852), 595.

² Ibid., p. 594.

³ *Leader*, vi (19 May 1855), 475.

sake of a higher principle, will prove to have been worth the keeping'.¹ So little novel and so much sermon did George Eliot find this book that she could review it only as a moral tract. This artistic transgression is made worse by the fact that the moral is itself false, 'neither the true doctrine of renunciation, nor a true representation of the realities of life'.² These two instances demonstrate George Eliot's attitude toward the problem of balancing moral with artistic purpose. The true artist will 'faithfully depict life and leave it to teach its own lesson, as the stars do theirs'.³

In her charge that Dickens was untrue to life in his character portrayal, George Eliot pointed out, as we have seen, that he succeeded admirably in creating an 'external' reality. Not all novelists whose work she reviewed were so skilful; she criticizes many for their failure to produce the verisimilitude that Dickens was able to attain. She complains repeatedly that lesser novelists cannot write real dialogue; their people talk melodrama. In 'Silly Novels by Lady Novelists', she cites from Lady Chatterton's *Compensation* an extreme example of a four-and-a-half-year-old child who says,

'Oh, I am so happy, dear gran'mamma;—I have seen,—I have seen such a delightful person: he is like everything beautiful,—like the smell of sweet flowers, and the view from Ben Lomond;—or no, *better than that*—he is like what I think of and see when I am very, very happy; . . .'⁴

George Eliot ironically comments that such talk exhibits 'symptoms alarmingly like those of adolescence repressed by gin'.

Even Charles Reade, whose power she recognizes and who took the most elaborate precautions to attain absolute reality, falls into unreal dialogue. His lapses, she charitably explains, perhaps stem from his habit of writing for the stage: 'In Mr. Reade's dialogue we are constantly imagining that we see a theatrical gentleman, well "made-up," delivering a repartee in an emphatic voice, with his eye fixed on the pit.'⁵ Other novelists violate reality by writing speeches which read like philosophical papers,⁶ speeches lacking perspective and balance (recounting each day's happenings in equally great detail),⁷ and speeches filled with impossible diction and syntax.

Unreality in plot and action, she contends, are all too common in the contemporary novel, particularly among the 'lady novelists', who cannot make their creations behave like real people. Perhaps the best support of this contention is her citation of a ridiculously melodramatic scene from *The Enigma* in which a masterful mother threatens to curse her son for

¹ lxiv (July 1855), 294.

⁴ lxvi (October 1856), 444.

⁶ lviii (July 1852), 285.

² Ibid., p. 295.

³ lvii (January 1852), 284.

⁵ Ibid., p. 574.

⁷ Ibid., p. 282.

daring to fall in love with a girl she had not chosen for him.¹ The popular novels of the day repeated a succession of worn-out plots with stereotyped characters. Too many novelists leaned on the crutch of coincidence; too many solved dilemmas with unexpected windfalls of good fortune. In others, though the action might be basically credible, the writer did not reveal it by character participation but merely described it, and it is the novelist's duty to make the reader imagine himself taking part in the action because the characters seem actually to participate. In a good novel the characters' behaviour reflects their personalities; they act as such people would naturally act under the circumstances given. Thus realistic behaviour (like realistic dialogue) grows artistically from real character.

These, then, George Eliot thought the most serious violations of her realistic creed: psychological unreality in the development of characters, the result often of over-sentimentality; excessive character analysis, leading to morbidity of tone; over-exactness in depicting scenes of a forbidding or disgusting nature; the distortion of truth to enforce particular moral precepts; and unreal dialogue, plots, and action.

Her predilection for realism affects also her view of the subject-matter appropriate to the novel. In her opinion, the lives of humble people provided ample material for the realistic novelist. For example, though she disliked many other features of the book, she approved of the simple story and commonplace characters of *The Wide, Wide World*.² She likewise complimented Mrs. Stowe for her choice of subject in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 'for slavery, besides being an abstract theory of human relations, and as such debateable, is a concrete reality of human life, and, as such, dramatizable'.³ It is a legitimate function of the novel to lay before the world specific social evils, and she was surprised that slavery had never before received such treatment. Art is well employed in such ways, since 'art's greatest benefit to men is to widen their sympathies':

No senator in Congress, no editor in a leading article, can come round the subject and round the reader, and into the heart of both so effectively, as this book—so superior is dramatic representation (where it can be employed) to the sharpest weapons of logic and the loudest thunders of oratory.⁴

In January 1856 George Eliot reviewed for the *Leader* a novel called *Rachel Gray*.⁵ She liked it for its attempt to treat the everyday joys and sorrows of quite ordinary people, a dressmaker and a small grocer:

Thus far 'Rachel Gray' is commendable: it occupies ground which is very far from being exhausted, and it undertakes to impress us with the every-day sorrows of our commonplace fellow men, and so to widen our sympathies.

¹ lxvi (October 1856), 452-3.

³ Ibid., p. 282.

⁴ Ibid.

² lviii (July 1852), 280-1.

⁵ vii (5 January 1856), 19.

Still, the author fell short in her broader attempt 'to show how Christianity exhibits itself as a refining and consoling influence in that most prosaic stratum of society, the small shop-keeping class'. The rest of the sentence is important in showing the direction of George Eliot's thinking: 'here is really a new sphere for a great artist who can paint from close observation, and who is neither a caricaturist nor a rose-colour sentimentalist'.¹

The suggestion that the lower and middle classes were appropriate subjects for fiction she repeated in October of the same year.² Speaking of the woefully inept efforts of evangelical lady novelists, she pointed out how inexcusable were their failures, surrounded as they were by

men and women whose manners and characters have not had all their bosses and angles rubbed down by refined conventionalism. It is less excusable in an Evangelical novelist, than in any other, gratuitously to seek her subjects among titles and carriages. The real drama of Evangelicalism—and it has abundance of fine drama for any one who has genius enough to discern and reproduce it—lies among the middle and lower classes; and are not Evangelical opinions understood to give an especial interest in the weak things of the earth, rather than in the mighty? Why then, cannot our Evangelical lady novelists show us the operation of their religious views among people (there really are many such in the world) who keep no carriage, 'not so much as a brass-bound gig', who even manage to eat their dinner without a silver fork, and in whose mouths the authoress's questionable English would be strictly consistent? Why can we not have pictures of religious life among the industrial classes in England, as interesting as Mrs. Stowe's pictures of religious life among the negroes?³

In her comments on *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Rachel Gray*, and other evangelical novels, George Eliot clearly favoured the use of contemporary subject-matter. She approved of *It is Never too Late to Mend*,⁴ with its emphasis on prison reform, *Doctor Antonio*,⁵ and *Lorenzo Benoni*,⁶ novels based on Italian agitation for freedom, and Mrs. Stowe's novels of slave life. The use of current events, however, was no guarantee of success, as she warned the author of a German novel, *Bilder aus dem Orientalischen Kriege*.⁷ Contemporary subjects might lend themselves readily to effective realism, but the novelist must still be an artist, not a mere reporter.

These views on the subject-matter of fiction perhaps led George Eliot to consider the process of artistic creation, of which she speaks in her

¹ vii (5 January 1856), 19.

² It is interesting to observe the seeds of *Scenes of Clerical Life* growing in the articles and reviews of 1856. According to George Eliot's *Journal*, the article 'Silly Novels by Lady Novelists', though published in October 1856, was finished on 12 September 1856, and *The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton* was begun on 22 September and finished on 5 November 1856. Thus when this passage appeared in print she was busy putting her theory into practice.

³ lxvi (October 1856), 457.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 573-5.

⁵ lxx (January 1856), 299-300.

⁶ lx (July 1853), 268-9.

⁷ lxx (April 1856), 642.

review of *Kathie Brand*, one of the last she wrote. In that novel the author had included two spectacular incidents, a shipwreck and the burning of York Minster, which were 'sufficiently unusual to have called forth all the writer's care'. Instead of producing the effect they could have, properly handled, they seem in context to be almost everyday occurrences. This is due, George Eliot says—and here she indicates her conception of the method by which the artist produces the illusion of reality—to the fact that they did not seem real to the author:

Instead of vividly realizing to herself the terrible scenes, and vividly representing them, either through their typical details or through the emotions which such scenes would inevitably raise in the mind of the sensitive spectator, the author writes about them, does not paint them. We feel that she was not present at either—she has not made them present to us. The reader sees nothing beyond the author's intention to produce an effect. An artist would have suffered his imagination to dwell on such scenes until, aided by his knowledge, either direct or indirect, the principal details became so vividly present to him that he could describe as if he saw them, and we should read as if we saw them too.¹

Her language here recalls Wordsworth's theory of poetic composition in the Preface to the 1800 edition of the *Lyrical Ballads*.

By the same process, she believed, the novelist created characters; here, too, *Kathie Brand* fails. The author, Holme Lee, did not fully realize her characters; there had been no 'dwelling of the imagination' on them. The result is creative failure, 'a blurred indistinctness' that 'prevents the writer from seeing where she is unlike nature'.² The novel is dull and heavy, not because of its quiet, fireside nature, but because

We do not live in the company of the personages; we do not hear them speak: we do not joy with them, and suffer with them. But the very choice of subject should have warned the writer that here more than elsewhere vivid reality was indispensable. When the imagination is actively creating unusual characters and startling incidents, we do not so closely scrutinize probability and truthful representation; but when the imagination moves amidst ordinary realities, if it does not realize them vividly, the result is inevitable weariness.³

Charles Reade also falls short of perfection in his concept of character, and for the same reason. The authors of *It is Never too Late to Mend* and

¹ lxvii (January 1857), 321.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., pp. 321–2. This point is developed with more picturesque metaphor in Chap. xvii of *Adam Bede*, where she says, 'The pencil is conscious of a delightful facility in drawing a griffin—the longer the claws, and the larger the wings, the better; but that marvellous facility which we mistook for genius is apt to forsake us when we want to draw a real unexaggerated lion.'

Dred, Reade and Mrs. Stowe respectively, are contrasted in the possession of a faculty which might be called genius, inspiration, or ingenuity:

Doubtless there is a great deal of nonsense talked about genius and inspiration, as if genius did not and must not labour; but, after all, there remains the difference between the writer who thoroughly possesses you by his creation, and the writer who only awakens your curiosity and makes you recognise his ability; and this difference may as well be called 'genius' as anything else. Perhaps a truer statement of the difference is, that the one writer is himself thoroughly possessed by his creation—he lives *in* his characters; while the other remains outside them, and dresses them up. Here lies the fundamental contrast between Mrs. Stowe's novel and Mr. Reade's.¹

While critics may disagree with George Eliot's preference for Mrs. Stowe over Reade, she undoubtedly shows sound judgement of the reality of his characters, who, perhaps because of his humanitarian purposes and his practice of writing for the stage, tend to become personified abstractions with an odour of grease-paint about them.

The close affinity of George Eliot's theories of the novel with the critical theories of Wordsworth should be clear. As he thought humble and rustic life ought to be the object of the poet's attention, so she believed it deserved the attention of the novelist. He believed poetry should be impregnated with moral ideas; she believed the same of the novel. He was the advocate of a realism which led the mind and spirit through external reality to the true, transcendental reality, and (though using a different terminology) so was she. She, writing in prose, could range more widely than he in the common, everyday language of men; she did not need to purify their diction.

George Eliot's five-year apprenticeship as a reviewer and editor enabled her to formulate her theory of fiction and to develop her prose style. Analysing the novels of others taught her to identify the stubborn problems of fiction, and put her on the path to solving them in her own fashion. Particularly during 1855 and 1856 her ideas of her art coalesced into the working formula that she was soon to follow in her own novels. Her reading must have convinced her that a great opportunity awaited the artist who could deal with lower and middle-class life in a thoroughly realistic, unsentimental fashion. She became more and more certain that she had something of value and interest to say and that she had the artistic skill to say it well. George Eliot's reviews show also that her belief in the novel as a medium for ethical teaching had developed early, and that her adherence to the school of realism was of long standing. In short, almost all the characteristics of George Eliot, the novelist, appeared in Marian Evans, the reviewer. No one who had read her reviews, knowing they were hers, should have been surprised at the appearance of *Scenes of Clerical Life* and *Adam Bede*.

¹ lxvi (October 1856), 574.

NOTES

THE GREEN KNIGHT SHOELESS AGAIN

IN her valuable discussion of the word *scholes* in l. 160 of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*,¹ Miss Cecily Clark brought forward a parallel from the late twelfth-century Spanish *Poema de Mio Cid*, in support of the interpretation 'shoeless'. Two passages in late twelfth-century French romance may offer further support.

In the *Erec et Enide* of Chrétien de Troyes, the hero is described as he sets out on a hunting expedition:

Sor un destrier estoit montez,
afublez d'un mantel hermin;
galopant vient tot le chemin;
s'ot cote d'un diapre noble
qui fu fez an Costantinoble;
chaues de paille avoit chauciees,
molt bien fetes et bien tailliees;
et fu es estriés afichiez,
uns esperons a or chauciez;
n'ot avoec lui arme aportee
fors que tant seulement s'espee.²

The Green Knight's array corresponds pretty closely to this. He has the *cote* (l. 152) and the *mantile* (l. 153); and he has the well-fitting hose and the gold spurs:

Heme wel-haled hose of þat same grene,
þat spenet on his sparlyr, and clene spures vnder
Of bryȝt golde, vpon silk bordes barred ful ryche,
And scholes vnder schankes þere þe schalk rides.³

The *silk bordes* can be paralleled from the *Roman d'Enéas*, where a rider (who wore *sandaires*, sandals)

esperons d'or ot an ses piez,
de bon orfrois ancorroiez.⁴

¹ *R.E.S.*, n.s. vi (1955), 174-7.

² *Erec*, ed. Mario Roques (Paris, 1953), ll. 94-104. Translation: 'He was mounted on a charger, and was dressed in an ermine mantle. He came galloping along. He wore a tunic of fine *diapre* made in Constantinople; he had put on hose of *paille*, very well made and neatly shaped; he had his feet in the stirrups and was wearing gold spurs. He had brought no weapon with him, except his sword.'

³ *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon (Oxford, 1925), ll. 157-60.

⁴ *Roman d'Enéas*, ed. J. J. Salverda de Grave (Paris, 1925-9), ll. 6397-8. Translation: 'He had gold spurs on his feet, attached by straps of fine *orfrois*.'

The *silk bordes* correspond to the bands of *orfrois* (bands of embroidery in which gold thread predominated) which were used to attach the spurs.

The second passage is from *Athis et Prophilias*. Here Athis, riding to his wedding, wore a mantle lined and bordered with fur and

D'une escarlate fu chauciez,
Esperons d'or ot an ses piez.
Sor un destrier an est montez.¹

These two descriptions, particularly Chrétien's, are carefully worked out; it is not likely that the authors would have omitted to mention shoes if they had been worn. Yet the spurs appear to be attached to feet clad only in hose. In contrast, the shoes (*soller*) are mentioned in the description of Camilla on horseback in the *Roman d'Enéas*.²

And since both Erec and Athis are bent on peaceful pursuits—a hunt, a wedding—these passages again help to underline the unwarlike character of the Green Knight's appearance.

MARJORY RIGBY

'DIE AND LIVE'

Of this extraordinary idiom there is a striking example in *As You Like It*, III. v. 7:

will you sterner be
Then he that dies and liues by bloody drops?

In the edition of the play in the old Clarendon Press series, Aldis Wright says that 'he that dies and liues by bloody drops' means he whose livelihood depends upon the exercise of the office of executioner, and he points out that this passage was illustrated in a note contributed by a correspondent, W. R. Arrowsmith, in *Notes and Queries* (Series 1, vii, (1853), 542-3) by two other passages of similar date:

He is a fole, and so shall he dye and lyue,
That thynketh him wyse, and yet can he no thyng.
(1509 Barclay, *The Ship of Fooles*, f. 72.)

Beholde howe readye we are, howe willing the women of Sparta will die and liue with their husbandes.

([1573] Lodowick Lloyd, *The Pilgrimage of Princes*, f. 8.)
(The preceding context of this passage speaks of 'your wiues and daughters' who 'woulde liue, if they might, after the death of their husbandes'.)

¹ *Athis et Prophilias*, ed. A. Hilka (Halle, 1912-16), II. 8683-5. Translation: 'His hose were of *escarlate*, and he had spurs on his feet. He was mounted on a charger.'

² *Enéas*, II. 4025-7. References and definitions have been drawn from Eunice R. Goddard's *Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Baltimore, 1927).

The Arden Shakespeare editor (J. W. Holme, 1914) reports Aldis Wright's reference and remarks on the amount of litter by way of conjectural emendation that is cleared away by this discovery, viz. *deals and lives* Theobald; *lives and thrives* Hanmer; *eyes, and lives* Capell; *lives and dies* Collier.

The N. & Q. correspondent added a much earlier example of the phrase from the Middle English translation of the *Roman de la Rose*:

With sorwe they bothe dye and liue
That vnto Richesse her hertis yiue. (ll. 5787-8.)

Now it turns out that here 'dye and liue' is a calque on the French of Jean de Meun, which reads:

En cel torment meurent e vivent
Cil qui les granz richeces sivent.
(*'They die and live in such torment who pursue great riches.'*)

And there is readily available another instance of the phrase in Old French in one of the versions of a passage in Pierre de Langtoft's Chronicle (Rolls edn. i. 302), viz.

Desuz Danekastre sunt les melz vanez
De tote Engleterre al rays Egbryth donez,
A vivre et morir pur lur herytez,

where two other manuscripts read 'A morir e a vivere' instead of 'A vivre et morir'. Robert Mannyng renders the lines thus (ed. Hearne, i. 17):

At Donkastre mot men se manyon to batale ride,
þat to þe kyng Egbriht alle were þei gyuen,
For þer heritage þer to die or lyuen.

Here the necessity of rhyme seems to have determined the order of the two verbs. But the use of 'or' is not warranted by the original; it is, however, oddly paralleled in the following passage of the Towneley Plays (xiv. 95) (one of the magi is speaking):

And certys for to lyf or dy
I shall not fayll
To that I in som land haue bene
To wyt what this starne may mene.

(*'And in truth I shall not cease to live or die until I have been abroad to learn what this star can mean.'*)

A remarkable precursor of the phrase *die and live* is to be seen in the Old English period, viz. in a passage in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,

an. 1052, of the 'Abingdon' version, where *licgan and libban* is used in the same way:

ƿa cwædon ealle ƿæt hi mid him woldon licgan and lybban.
(‘They all declared that they would die and live with him.’)

Here the ‘Worcester’ version has the verbs in the order *libban and licgean*. In his glossary Plummer, s.v. *libban*, gives a composite gloss for the two readings, viz. ‘to live or die’, which is inaccurate and misleading. The two verbs occur again in collocation in the Parker Chronicle, an. 901:

Æðelwald . . . sæde ƿæt he wolde oðer oððe ƿær libban oððe ƿær licgan.

In the passages here quoted *licgan* means ‘to lie dead’, ‘to be dead’, ‘to die’, a sense represented specifically in the use of the present participle for ‘dead’, ‘inanimate’, in technical opposition to *libbende* ‘living’, ‘live’, as in:

Eall ƿæt ic hæbbe on libbandan and on licgendan
(*Anglo-Saxon Charters*, ed. Thorpe, 548. 12),
nan ƿinc . . . ne libbende ne licgende

(*Laws of Cnut* ii. 24; rendered ‘mobile uel immobile’ in *Quadripartitus*),

and *licgende feoh* ‘lifeless chattels’, rendering *auri atque argenti* in Alfred’s *Orosius*, ed. Sweet, 116. 32:

ƿær wæs xx m horsa gefangen, ƿeh hie ðær nan licgende feoh ne metten;

and used for ‘ready money’ in Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints*, ix. 54:

oð ƿæt heo beceapode ƿa scinendan gymmas and eac hire land-are wið licgendum
[correction of MS. lincgendum] feo.

C. T. ONIONS

SIR THOMAS WILSON’S TRANSLATION OF MONTEMAYOR’S *DIANA*

It was in 1596 that Thomas Wilson, disappointed in his hopes of a fellowship at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, spent ‘many ydle howres, in transplanting vaine amorous conceits out of an Exotique language’ while ‘iourneying wth y^e vnpleasing Proccaccios of Italy or the clumps Waganors of Germany, and the Muletiers of other parts’.¹ The object of his labours,

¹ The translation, together with an introduction from which these details are taken, was reprinted by H. Thomas in the *Revue Hispanique*, I (1920), 367-418.

the *Diana* of Jorge de Montemayor or Montemôr,¹ was a popular book throughout the last third of the sixteenth century in France and England as well as in Spain. Sir Philip Sidney doubtless read it before writing the *Arcadia*, and Shakespeare before writing *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. It may be that both read it in the French version by Nicolas Collin, published at Rheims in 1578, for no published English translation is known until 1598.² In that year appeared the translation of Bartholomew Yong (dedicated, incidentally, to Penelope, Lady Rich, Sidney's 'Stella'), which, he tells us, was completed fifteen years earlier. Yong also tells us in his preface that a certain Edward Paston had made a fragmentary translation even earlier. This translation may have circulated in manuscript, but we have no means of knowing what it included; it is also possible that Sidney may have seen Yong's version before it was printed.

Wilson's version has no discoverable literary connexions of this kind. He professed to have made it only 'to entertaine my thoughts, & to keepe my English'; but whether or not this is true, his work gains a measure of interest both from the apparent history of the extant manuscript and from its linguistic features. The copy that is now in the British Museum as Additional MS. 18638 is dedicated to 'the right honorable Sr Fulke Grevyll knight Privie Counsellor to his Ma^{ty} & Chancell^r of the Exchequer' and is therefore to be placed between the years 1614 and 1620, when Greville was raised to the peerage. Even at this early date the text was incomplete (it contains only the first of the seven Books of the *Diana*), and in his introduction Wilson says he lost the rest in his travels through 'thinking of other things'. His promise to supply the missing portion to Greville when it can be found may or may not be pure form. More important is the question whether the manuscript is Wilson's autograph, for this affects the weight to be assigned to certain of its linguistic features. Its first editor stated that it was an autograph copy, but gave no reason for his belief. On the other hand, the manuscript appears to be in one hand throughout; and Wilson writes in his introduction that he 'caused the spanish of the Verses to be postilled with (i.e. set alongside) the English', which is at least a curious expression to use if he himself was the writer.

The Museum authorities have noted on p. 1^r of the manuscript that it was 'Purchased of the Earl of Denbigh, 1851'. On its fly-leaf it bears the book-plate of Basil Feilding, dated 1702; he was the fourth Earl of Denbigh. In the middle of p. 2^v, however, stand the words 'E Debigh Elizabeth Denbigh' and at the foot of the page this Elizabeth has written

¹ He was a Portuguese turned Spaniard.

² There does not seem to be any evidence that Sidney knew Spanish, except so far as anyone would who knew Italian well.

'For my dear husband Lord Denbigh'.¹ As it happens, only one Lady Denbigh was named Elizabeth before 1702, and she was Elizabeth Bourchier, third wife of Basil, second Earl, and daughter of the fourth Earl of Bath.² Her words appear to be a presentation inscription; and the natural inference that the manuscript had been in the possession of the Bourchier family is confirmed by a signature 'Anne Bourchier' on p. 71^v. The last clue that the manuscript offers to its own history is yet another signature, also on p. 2^v and above the scrawlings of Lady Denbigh: 'Dorothy Greuell', in large, carefully formed letters, followed by the tantalizing word 'when' with a meaningless flourish after it. This person is no doubt the sister of Robert Greville, Fulke Greville's nephew, adopted son, and heir; with a little imagination one can picture her using a clean page of her uncle's new book to repeat a writing lesson, and being interrupted abruptly. But at this point we enter the realm of conjecture. It is probable that the manuscript was inherited by Robert Greville when his uncle died. It is possible that it passed to the Bourchiers through his wife, whose father was apparently on intimate terms with the father of Elizabeth Bourchier.³ It does not seem that the direct link between Robert Greville and the second Earl of Denbigh (who succeeded Greville in the former's military command during the Civil War) had anything to do with the passage of the manuscript, however pleasing it would be to imagine Lord Denbigh, who as Ambassador at Venice later acquired some note as a connoisseur of art, seeing it among his predecessor's papers and setting his wife to work to get it for him through her family connexions.

To facilitate the discussion of Wilson's translation, extracts are here given of both prose and verse in the original and in his version:

Pues llegando el pastor a los verdes y
deleitosos prados que el caudaloso río
Ezla con sus aguas va regnando, le vino
a la memoria el gran contentamiento
de que en algún tiempo allí gozado
avía, siendo tan señor de su libertad,
como entonces sujeto a quien sin
causa lo tenía sepultado en las tinieblas
de su olvido. Considerava aquel dicho-
so tiempo que por aquellos prados y

Therefore y^e Sheppard drawing to-
wardes the greene delightfull Mead-
owes, w^{ch} the cringling river Ezla
moystneth wth his waters, there came
to his remembrance the greate content-
ment, w^{ch} some tymes he had enjoyed
there, being as much the Lord of his
owne libertie as hee was then subject
to one who had causleslie buried him
in the darknes of oblivion. Hee medi-

¹ She has also copied a 'reseatt' for an almond sauce on p. 71^r. To this is attached the impossible date 1613, apparently copied with the recipe from her mother's cookery book.

² Gibbs, *The Complete Peerage*, under 'Denbigh' and 'Bath'.

³ I am indebted here to Mr. T. Alan Bennett, who writes: 'There is a letter among the Coke MSS. (*Hist. MSS. Comm. Cowper ii*) from Francis Earl of Bedford relating to a marriage proposed between Edward 4th Earl [of Bath] and Lady Dorothy Seymour. Francis Earl of Bedford was the father of Catherine Russell whom Robert Greville married.'

hermosa ribera apacentava su ganado,
poniendo los ojos en solo el interesse
que de traelle bien apacentado se le
seguía y las horas que le sobravan,
gastava el pastor en solo gozar del
suave olor de las doradas flores, al
tiempo que la primavera, con las
alegres nuevas del verano, se esparze
por el universo.

¡ Cabellos, cuánta mudança
he visto después que os ví !
¡ y cuán mal parece ay
essa color de esperança !

Bien pensaba yo, cabellos,
aunque con algún temor,
que no fuera otro pastor
digno de verse cabe ellos.

¡ Ay, cabellos, cuántos días
la mi Diana mirava
si os traya o si os dexava
y otras cien mil niñerías !

Y quantas vezes llorando
! ay lágrimas engañosas !
pedía celos de cosas
de que yo estava burlando.

Los ojos que me matavan
dezí, dorados cabellos,
¿ que culpa tuve en creellos
pues ellos me asseguravan ?

¿ No vistes vos que algún día
mil lágrimas derramava
hasta que yo le jurava
que sus palabras creía ?

¿ Quién vió tanta hermosura
en tan mudable subjecto
y en amador tan perfecto ?
¿ Quién vió tanta desventura ?

tated vppon y^t fortunate tyme wherein
by those Meades and faire streames he
had fed his flockes, haueing regard only
to y^e profit he found in y^e feeding there-
of, and his spare howres the sheppard did
bestowe only in the sweetes mells [*sic*]
of the golden flowres att the tyme when
the springe with his chearefull dewes
of the New yeare spredd it self ouer all.

Ah hairees what change there is
since first I did you vewe
how ill befiteth this
fresh collored hoping hewe

This hope me once did hould
though somewhat fearingly
that neuer Shepard should
deserue your loue but I

Ah hairees how often did
Diana for you seeke
within my bosome hid
with toyes ten thousand lyke

How oft she shew'd wth teares
Ah teares frō fained brest
that iealously she feares
that which I did in iest

But tell me hairees of gould
those eyes w^{ch} wrought me woe
refuse to trust who cold
sith they secur'd me soe

You saw from them some day
a thousand teares ther rain'd
till I did sweare and say
I thought her words wer faind

Who ever beauty knewe
in such a changing eye
or in a louver true
so hard a destinie

¿O cabellos, no os corréis
por venire a do venistes
viéndome cómo me vistes
en verme cómo me véis?

Ah haires yo^w must not pass
thither frō whence you came
that saw me as I was
and see me as I am

Sobre el arena sentada
de aquel río la ví yo
do, con el dedo escrivíó:
Antes muerta que mudada.

On sands where she did sitt
the river runing by
with finger thus she writt
rather then alter dy

Mira el amor lo que ordena
que os viene a hazer creer
cosas dichas por mujer
y escritas en el arena.

Loe here of loue a token
to trust that, y^t can stand
that's by a woman spoken
and written in the sand^t

As translation this is obviously too bad to deserve extended comment. About a man who is under the impression that *ribera* means 'river', and who can translate *que sus palabras creía* by 'I thought her words wer faind', the less said the better. His verses, too, are complete strangers to the graces, let alone the Muses. In either medium one never knows what is coming next, but it is likely to be something unexpected, as the following examples may show:

he . . . determined to breake the neck = determinó de estorvar esta buena fortuna de this good ffortune of Montano's tuna de M.
(p. 410)

ffor since Imagination/Doth swaie y^e = Pues que la imaginación/haze causa en sterne of every hart (p. 417) todo estado

Nor t'is noe Chick that is wth churk- = ni cosa que, en llamándola, se viene ing gott (p. 382)

I sighd but sighes on Adders eares = sospiros dí, mas nunca fuy oydo haue lighted (p. 381)

The naïve informality of Wilson's style and vocabulary, however, lends a certain interest to his fragment, which includes a number of out-of-the-way words and expressions. Some of these have a northern or East Anglian flavour: Wilson was matriculated at St. John's College, Cambridge, as 'norfolcensis'.² In reprinting the manuscript, the editor contented himself with drawing attention to some of them; the following notes include a few which he did not mention and add some comments.

BRASE (= arm of the sea; see *O.E.D.*, s.v. *BRACE sb.*): 'how shee would leade my flocke to the Brase' (p. 384). By a manuscript correction 'water' has been

¹ Montemayor, *Diana*, ed. F. López Estrada (Madrid, 1946), pp. 9, 13-14; *Revue Hispanique* as cited above, pp. 375, 377-8.

² See *D.N.B.*

substituted for 'brase', which the author apparently judged, on second thoughts, not widely enough current. The original has simply *al río*.

CAUTELLOUS: 'moue the hart of the cautelous Ismenia' (p. 403). The original has *cautelosa*; but in other places Wilson changes his rendering to 'deceitfull' and 'craftie' (pp. 405, 406).

CRINGLE (see *O.E.D.* s.v. CRINGLE-CRANGLE): 'the cringling river Ezla' (p. 375). This word translates *caudaloso* (= abundant), which Wilson evidently mistook to mean 'twisting' (he renders it elsewhere by 'wynding' and 'torteous'). *E.D.D.* reports the word from Norfolk and Lancashire, but in this sense only from the latter, and not before the nineteenth century.

KEEM: To comb her hair in a mirror held by her lover is, of course, a favourite occupation of any shepherdess of romance, and the word occurs a number of times. Twice, in verse, Wilson uses 'combing' and 'combe'; in prose, 'keming', 'keemed' and 'keeming' (resp. pp. 393, 395, 411, 385, and 384). Possibly 'combe' is felt to be more 'refined'.

METT (= measure): 'as shee iumppes iust with the foot mett of your owne inclinations' (p. 399), a picturesque rendering of *en acertar ella a no salir jamás de lo que pide vuestra inclinación*. *E.D.D.* records from the north and east.

MISINCENCE: 'How much my self I misincence' (p. 413), for original *¡Quán fuera estoy . . . !* A derivative, apparently unrecorded elsewhere, of *insense* 'inform', of which *O.E.D.* notes: 'From 17th c. app. only dialectal (chiefly northern).'

PARR (see *O.E.D.* s.v. PAR *sb.*³): 'some of my Goates (*w^{ch}* in a parr hard by my howse were cupled vpp' (p. 411). The word translates *corral*. The earliest *O.E.D.* record of it is in the nineteenth century, and *E.D.D.* has it from Lincolnshire and East Anglia.

PLAY: 'matters which we sheppards hold of price, as . . . to plaie' (p. 391), where the original has *luchar*, rendered uniformly elsewhere by 'wrestle'. *O.E.D.* has no mention of such a sense, though it does give (sense 25, with one dubious example) a meaning similar to 'contend'.

POSTIL: 'I haue caused the spanish of the Verses to be postilled with the English' (Introduction, p. 374), not recorded in *O.E.D.* in the sense of 'set alongside'. The manuscript had 'apostilled', but the first two letters have been crossed out.

PROCCACCIO: 'y^e vnpleasing Proccaccios of Italy' (Introduction, p. 372). *Procaccio* is defined by Florio [*A Worlde of Wordes*, 1598], 'a carrier or poste, namely the ordinarie poste that goeth betweene Rome and Naples', and Cotgrave has almost the same. *O.E.D.* records its use in English from Evelyn, 1645.

TELLED (p.ptc.): 'greefe y^t telled is' (p. 392). This form was required, in verse, to rhyme with 'vnquelled is' and 'expelled is'. The manuscript has 'toulde' with a later correction, as if the writer had realized the special reason for the form.

D. M. ANDERSON

SHAKESPEARE AND LEWKENOR

The Commonwealth and Gouernment of Venice, by Cardinal Gasper Contareno (i.e. Contarini), translated by Sir Lewes Lewkenor, was published in 1599 with a dedicatory sonnet by Edmund Spenser. Malone suggested in his notes on two passages in *Othello*—'officers of the night' (1. i. 183) and 'double as the Duke's' (1. ii. 14)—that Shakespeare had read Contareno's book; and H. C. Hart pointed out that, in one of the passages quoted by Malone, Lewkenor used the word 'weaponed' (cf. v. ii. 266). Certainly the book would have provided Shakespeare with useful background information, and it may be worth while to offer some additional evidence that Shakespeare consulted it.

The translator uses the word *intentiue* and Shakespeare's sole use of the derivative *intently* occurs in *Othello*. Shakespeare would likewise have found in this book the word *signeory* (used as a synonym for the Venetian government), and he does not elsewhere use the word in this sense. A dedicatory sonnet by Maur. Kiffen praises Venice as a city

Where all corrupt means to aspire are curb'd,
And officers for vertues worth elected.
The contrarie whereof hath much disturb'd
All states, where the like cause is vnrespected.

Iago's complaint that he has been passed over in favour of Cassio is a motive not given by Giraldi, and it is noteworthy that he contrasts the good old days, when promotion was by merit, with the degenerate times in which he lives.

It may be mentioned that Lewkenor in his Address to the Reader speaks of his pleasure in conversing with travellers:

of which sorte it hath been my happinesse to be beholding to sundry nations for their friendly conuersation, who neuer were so willing at any time to speake, as I euer was ready to receiue their discourses with an attentiu eare.

Lewkenor also contrasts the 'soft beds' of those who stay at home with the hardships of travellers, the 'many carefull thoughtes, industrious peniuries and painful inconueniences'. He speaks of the pleasure to be obtained from

the description of forreine regions, the manners & customes of farre distant countries, the diuersitie of their complexions, humor, diet and attire, and such like other singularities, especially if they come from the mouth of a wise and well speaking trauellor, to whose tongue I would willingly endure to haue mine eares enclined.

Lewkenor confesses, 'My education hath been in the wars.' In the Epistle

Dedicatory he apologizes for 'the vntuned harshnesse of my disioynted stile' and speaks of 'the violence of my own fortune'.

As there is no hint of Othello's method of wooing in Giraldi, Shakespeare may have derived it from the passages quoted above. Othello apologizes for his 'rude' speech and excuses it by his education in the wars. Desdemona would 'seriously incline' to hear his tales and 'with a greedy ear' she devoured up his discourse. Othello speaks of his hardships and contrasts the 'flinty and steel couch of war' with the 'bed of down' of civilians. Desdemona refers to her 'downright violence and storm of fortunes'. Taken in conjunction with the parallels offered by Malone and Hart, this new evidence seems to provide good grounds for believing that Shakespeare knew the book.

KENNETH MUIR

DEFINITIONS OF LOVE

MR. DAVISON (*R.E.S.* N.S. vi (1955), 141-6) has once more raised the question of the title of Marvell's poem; and this note is a small addition to the information assembled in his paper.

Miss Tuve's remarkable contribution to the subject really amounts to a deduction that Renaissance poets must have had something corresponding to the *definition* of the rhetoricians; she finds poems which bear the marks of having been written in accordance with some such prescription. That she is right we can prove by showing that there was a genre called the *Definition*, described and identified as early as 1548.

The work in which the genre is recognized is the *Art poétique françois* of Thomas Sebillet, a book known to have been extremely influential. Sebillet distinguishes between Definition and Description as a logician might: the former 'exprime la sustance de la chose définie, et le naturel fond d'elle. Et la description peint et colore seulement la chose descrite par ses propriétés et qualitez accidentaires . . .' (ed. Gaiffe (Paris, 1910), p. 170). The illustrations he provides are a *definition of love* by Mellin de Saint-Gelays, and a *description of love* in an anonymous translation of some Latin verses by Marullus. Sebillet describes these genres as newly discovered and, as yet, not much practised.

The Description is an account, in the form of questions and answers, of Cupid, moralizing his blindness. The Definition is a sombre and hostile analysis of sexual love.

Qu'est ce qu'Amour? est-ce une Dêité
Regnant sur nous, ou volonté naissante
Sans quelque force, et sans nécessité?
C'est un pouvoir qui par secrète sente
Se joint au cœur dissimulant sa force,
Et se fait maistre avant que lon le sente.

C'est un discord et général divorce
D'entre le sens et le vray jugement,
Laissant le fruit pour la fœille et l'escorce. . . .

Such poems are the ancestors of those cited by Miss Tuve; Raleigh's 'Now what is Love' is in the fullest sense a Definition of Love.

But Miss Tuve's 'and so on down to Marvell', echoed by Mr. Davison, will not really do. Marvell's poem has not the distinctive characteristics of the Definition. His poem begins 'My love . . .' and is not at all concerned to express 'la sustance . . . et le naturel fond' of love considered in the abstract; it is the rarity, the unusual qualities, of his particular love, that the poem deals with. The best that can be said for Marvell's title is that the poem offers a hostile analysis of the commonplace, sublunary kind of love by bringing it into comparison with the specially pure variety (hence all the imagery of the incorruptible heavens) that it celebrates. But this does not make it a Definition in Sebillet's sense; it distinguishes but it does not define. There is certainly a mystery about this title; dare one suggest that it was attached to the poem by mistake?

What is more, the argument of Marvell's poem is not in the least like those of the poems concerning 'the alternation of Hope and Despair' mentioned by Mr. Davison. Hope gets no showing whatever. The only poem I have come across that bears any resemblance to Marvell's enormous celebration of despair in love is Desportes' 'Le mal qui me rend miserable'. Normal love, he says,

Se conserve avec l'esperance,
Et trouve repos au plaisir.

But

Mon amour est d'une autre sorte:
Le desespoir la rend plus forte,
Elle renaist de son trespas:
Perdant elle acquiert la victoire,
C'est une chose forte à croire,
Aussi vous ne le croyez pas.
Tout ce que l'univers enserre
Tend au bien, le cherche et le suit,
Le feu, l'air, les eaux, et la terre,
Et tout ce qui d'eux est produit:
Moy seul de moy-mesme adversaire
Je cours à ce qui m'est contraire
Et ne fuy rien tant que mon bien;
Je rens ma douleur incurable . . .

and so on. I certainly do not propose that this be counted yet another source for Marvell's poem; the tale is bewildering enough already. But it

may be taken as an indication that there was another genre, perhaps loosely related to the Definition, in the context of which this great poem may one day be studied. At present it is the only important poem of Marvell's which cannot certainly be placed in such a context.

FRANK KERMODE

TWO MANUSCRIPT POEMS OF COLERIDGE

ALTHOUGH Coleridge did not publish 'The Knight's Tomb' until 1834,¹ the last three lines of his poem were quoted incorrectly in Chapter VIII of *Ivanhoe* (1819) and again in Chapter IX of *Castle Dangerous* (1831). The quotation of the poem in *Ivanhoe* resolved any doubts that Coleridge may still have had about the authorship of the Waverley novels, for he knew that Scott had had access to some form of 'The Knight's Tomb'.² According to James Gillman, the poem was composed by Coleridge 'as an experiment for a metre, and repeated by him to a mutual friend—this gentleman the following day dined in company with Sir Walter Scott, and spoke of his visit to Highgate, repeating Coleridge's lines to Scott, and observing at the same time, that they might be acceptable to the author of Waverley'.³

An unpublished manuscript in the Cornell University Library identifies the 'mutual friend' as John Hookham Frere.⁴ It is of particular interest because it offers Coleridge's account of a grievance that, in addition to Scott's borrowings from *Christabel* in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*, probably influenced his attitude toward Scott.⁵ The manuscript, which is in Coleridge's own hand, reads thus:

S. T. Coleridge
20 Oct. 1824

Here follow the Lines ~~in~~ first written down but very incorrectly by Sir W. Scott in one of his Novels—who had them from J. H. Frere to whom I had repeated

¹ *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge* (London, 1834), ii. 64 f.

² James Gillman, *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1838), p. 277. Coleridge probably knew of Scott's authorship even earlier. On 17 May 1818 the *Examiner* (p. 313) noted that Scott's secret was 'no longer kept'.

³ *Life of Coleridge*, p. 277.

⁴ For permission to publish this manuscript, which is on a half sheet of rough paper $4\frac{7}{8} \times 7\frac{1}{8}$ in. in size, I am indebted to the Cornell Library Board.

⁵ In a letter to the Rev. Edward Coleridge in 1827, he wrote: 'My judgement is in perfect coincidence with your remarks on Sir Walter; and when I think of the wretched trash, that the Lust of Gain enduced him to publish for the last three or four years, . . . even my feelings assist in hardening me. . . . I have enough to feel for without wasting my Sympathy on a Scotchman suffering the penalty of his Scotchery' (*Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Earl Leslie Griggs (London, 1932), ii. 402).

them as an experiment in metre that had passed thro' my brain—Suppose it the first Stanza of a Ballad—

Where is the Grave of Sir Arthur O'Relhan?

Where may the Grave of that good man be?

By the side of a Spring, on the breast of Helvellan,

Under the Twigs of a Young Birch Tree!

The Oak that in / sum mer was / sweet to hear

And rustled it's / leaves in the / Fall of o' the Year,

And whistled / and roar'd in / the Winter / , alone—

Is gone! And the Birch in it's stead is grown.

The Knight's Bones are Dust:

And his Good Sword Rust:

His Soul is with the Saints, I trust.¹

These lines were presumably quoted to Frere at some time between 15 April 1816, when Coleridge moved to the Gillman home at Highgate, and December 1819, when *Ivanhoe* was published. Since Frere was still alive in 1838, Gillman may have been reluctant to identify him by name.² Yet there appears to be a discrepancy in Gillman's account, for Scott is not known to have been in the vicinity of London between September 1815 and March 1820. Unless he made a long journey that has escaped his biographers and editors, it was impossible during this interval for anyone to have visited Coleridge at Highgate on one day and to have dined with Scott on the next. Frere, who during this period often visited the Gillman home, must have informed Coleridge that he had in some way transmitted 'The Knight's Tomb' to Scott.³ John G. Lockhart obviously had access to a transcript of the entire poem, since he quoted a corrupt version of the text in the appendix to the 1834 edition of *Castle Dangerous* and called it 'a beautiful unpublished fragment of Coleridge'.

The Cornell manuscript of 'The Knight's Tomb' furnishes what Coleridge himself considered to be the correct version and also provides his scansion of this metrical experiment. The text differs from the 1834

¹ In *The Poems of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1852), Sara (Mrs. H. N.) Coleridge dated the poem 1802, the year of her own birth. The Coleridges in 1802 were living in Keswick, not far from Helvellyn. James Dykes Campbell, in *The Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1893), dated the poem '1817'. Many subsequent editors, including E. H. Coleridge, have accepted Campbell's date.

² In addition to being a friend of Coleridge and Scott, Frere was intimately acquainted with the Gillman family, with whom he corresponded from Malta long after Coleridge's death in 1834. See Lucy E. Watson's *Coleridge at Highgate* (London, 1925).

³ Coleridge's earliest mention of J. H. Frere is in a letter to John Murray, dated 8 May 1816. There Coleridge alludes to the 'Red Letter Day' on which he first met Frere but does not provide the date of this meeting. See *Unpublished Letters*, ii. 167.

printed version in the surname of the knight, in the spelling of Helvellyn to rhyme with O'Relhan, and in the use of 'o' rather than 'of' in the sixth line. The knight's surname in Coleridge's manuscript deserves special attention because in the Lockhart version, which is probably based on what Frere made of Coleridge's oral delivery, it appears similarly as 'Orellan'. The name 'O'Kellyn' in the 1834 text is either a subsequent revision or a typographical error.

On the back of the half sheet that Coleridge used for 'The Knight's Tomb' is a portion of his 'Youth and Age', transcribed by Joseph Henry Green.¹ At least three other manuscripts of this poem are extant.² The text of the Cornell manuscript, printed below, resembles more closely than any of the other known versions the 'fair copy' originally presented to Derwent Coleridge and later used by E. H. Coleridge in the compilation of his text of 'Youth and Age'.

unknown of yore,
On winding lakes and rivers wide;
That ask no aid of sail or oar,
That fear no spite of wind or tide!
Nought cared this Body for wind or weather,
When Youth and I liv'd in't together.

2

Flowers are lovely; Love is flowerlike;
Friendship is a sheltring Tree.
O! the Joys, that came down showerlike,
Of Beauty, Truth, and Liberty,
Ere I was old!
Ere I was old! ah woful Ere,
Which tells me, Youth's no longer here.
O Youth! for years so many and sweet
'Tis known, that thou and I were one.

FREDERICK L. BEATY

¹ Dr. Green, one of Coleridge's most devoted friends, often served as amanuensis.

² See *The Poems of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge (London, 1912), p. 439 n.

REVIEWS

Introduction to Old English. By G. L. BROOK. Pp. xi+138. Manchester: University Press, 1955. 10s. 6d. net.

Altenglisches Elementarbuch. By M. LEHNERT. Pp. 178 (Sammlung Götschen 1125). Berlin: De Gruyter, 3rd edn., 1955. DM. 2.40.

Professor Brook's *Introduction to Old English* widens the choice of books available to beginners. It contains information on spelling and pronunciation, an outline of the grammar, and some notes on syntax, and ends with five short texts, with notes and a glossary. The phonology and morphology are somewhat fuller than in other books of this type, as certain dialectal details are added to help in the reading of Early West Saxon or poetic texts.

This book will be found useful by teachers who prefer to include phonological details—such as the relative chronology of the OE. sound-changes—fairly early in the course, instead of leaving them till a later stage when some proficiency in translation has been attained. The choice between these two procedures is largely a matter of departmental policy or personal taste; Mr. Brook claims that 'his chief concern has been with those who, without intending to become specialists in Old English, wish to acquire enough knowledge of the grammar to enable them to read Old English texts', but the standard he in fact sets them would appear to be somewhat higher. Admittedly, it is eminently fitting that any candidate for Honours should know that *tōp* comes from **tanþ*-, that *wer* is cognate with Lat. *vir*, or that an *o* might have been expected in *full*; but, to be honest, we should also admit that he will learn such details as part of his knowledge of the history and evolution of the English language, and not especially to enable him to read *Beowulf*.

As is usual in such elementary books, some tutorial guidance is tacitly assumed. For instance, the student will need to know what dating is implied in terms like 'primitive Old English', 'the earliest surviving Old English texts', or 'Early West Saxon'; similarly, the relevance of words like *slēan*, *cýse*, *bræmbas* to the chronology of the sound-changes is stated only briefly, and further exposition may be required. A few statements require qualification, e.g. that the subjunctive is used simply 'in adverbial clauses of time and place' or 'to express result'; and similarly the implication that a present participle + *wesan* is necessarily equivalent to an imperfect tense might have been avoided.¹ Actual errors are few: I note that on p. 40 *hæle* is referred to the *n*-declension instead of the *i*-declension; on p. 62, the distinction made between *hieran* 'hear' and *gehieran* 'obey' runs counter to

¹ I note here a few further doubtful points: (i) not all will agree that OE. *ƿ* was 'trilled in all positions'; (ii) two noun-declensions are given the label 'strong', while the remaining eight—whether weak or strong—receive no corresponding label; (iii) to say that the definite article is 'omitted' in *þæs cyninges pegnas* (p. 88) or *þære cwēne hæs* (p. 115) seems doubtful terminology, since from a functional viewpoint *þæs cyninges* and *þære cwēne* themselves perform the 'defining' instead of the article.

the actual usage,¹ and this error is repeated in the glossary, where *gehīrde* in the selection from *Apollonius of Tyre* is glossed 'obey', although the context demands 'hear' and the Latin original has *audivit*.

Altenglisches Elementarbuch continues the tradition established by Sammlung Göschén of presenting a large amount of detailed information in a short space; and if Sweet's remark that a German 'is able to acquire a practical knowledge of Old English from a crabbedly theoretical exposition which would baffle an English learner' still holds good, Professor Lehnert's readers may consider themselves liberally catered for. The phonology and morphology are comparative-historical, and are set out in a style reminiscent of Brugmann or Walde-Pokorný, while information at a more elementary level is given on OE. history, literature, orthography, metre, and vocabulary; there are also some prose selections with a parallel German translation, and the glossary and index of OE., OHG., ON., Gothic, and Latin words is a sizeable item, taking up 42 pages of the total. On some points there are footnotes referring the reader to works published since 1940, but on the whole the treatment is conservative and conventional. Typical examples are: the Indo-European 'family-tree', the definition of Gmc. *ð* as a 'labial spirant as in MnE. *give*' (*sic*), or the statements that the use of vowels in final syllables in Late Northumbrian was 'ziemlich unterschiedslos', that a number of symbols in the OE. alphabet were 'mehrdeutig', or that the original West-Saxon settlements were confined to an area south of the Thames.

What might otherwise have been a useful and handy collection of facts is marred chiefly by two faults. Firstly, the presentation is over-simplified to the extent of at least a dozen misleading statements like 'got. *hausida* > ae. *hīerde*', 'ahd. *gart* > OE. *geard*', and 'ahd. *haft* < Lat. *captus*'; through mistaken economy in column-printing, the noun *ealu* has the appearance of being classified as feminine; and there are a few gaps in continuity, e.g. a 'früh ae. *æ* in druckschwachen Silben' appears on p. 74 but does not seem to have been accounted for up to that point. Secondly, the choice of material is not wholly in proportion: for some of the details from Indo-European and Germanic, the reader could have been referred to parallel volumes in the same series, and the space thus saved could have been used on some account of OE. syntax, an essential part of an *Elementarbuch* but unfortunately lacking in this one.

M. L. SAMUELS

Pall Mall: Beiträge zur Etymologie und Quantitätstheorie. By H. M.

FLASDIECK. Pp. 255 (reprinted from *Anglia*, lxxii (1954)). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1955. DM. 24.

Professor Flasdieck's new book is divided into four parts of very unequal length. Part I discusses the three current pronunciations of the London street-

¹ See Bosworth-Toller s.v. *hýran* and *gehýran*, and the glossaries to Klaeber's edition of *Beowulf* and to Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*. In this verb the prefix is not 'resultative' as in Professor Brook's other two examples, but 'punctual'; consequently, it is the simplex *hieran* which has the durative meaning 'listen to, obey', while *gehieran*, which originally meant 'hear at a given point of time, on a certain occasion' came to be generalized as the all-purpose verb for this notion.

name *Pall Mall* and the social differentiation they involve. The facts are likely to be already familiar to English readers, but the explanation of the pronunciation [pel mel] is new and plausible: the French *palle-maille* was first adopted in the north, where the two elements of the compound were replaced by the dialect words *pell* 'to drive' and *mell* 'hammer', the latter cognate with the original, the former unrelated to it; the adoption of the northern pronunciation in London notwithstanding the accepted spelling *Pall Mall* was due to the influence of the Stuarts. Parts II and IV discuss the etymologies of *pell* 'to drive' and *mell/mall/maul* 'hammer' respectively. The verb *pell* comes from an unrecorded OF. derivative of Latin *pellere*; *mell/mall/maul* represents an unrecorded OE. **mielle/melle/mælle* derived from an Ingvaenonic adoption of Latin *malleus*. Before reaching these conclusions Dr. Flasdieck eliminates in turn each of the numerous homonyms and near-homonyms of *pell* and *mell*, and students will be grateful for an authoritative discussion of a number of rare and difficult words. Particularly valuable is the treatment of the thorny question of the fate of OF. 'l mouillé' in English, and the explanation of such difficult forms as *cull* beside *coyl* from *cueillir*.

Much the most important section of the book is Part III, considerably longer than the other three sections put together: it is nothing less than a full-scale study of the quantity of vowels in OF., and represents a continuation and elaboration of Dr. Flasdieck's recent work in this field.¹ It is first demonstrated, on the lines laid down by Keller long ago,² that the quantity of the vowels in ME. borrowings from OF. cannot be explained in terms of the phonology of English: OF., therefore, in spite of the silence of the Romance philologists, must have distinguished vowels by quantity as well as by quality. The distribution of quantity in OF. is in the main an extension of the Vulgar Latin system, in which vowels are long in an open syllable and short in a closed syllable. Dr. Flasdieck discusses each variety of position in turn, without, however, distinguishing between vowels which were already long in VL. from those which according to his view became long in the course of the development of OF., nor between popular words and learned or semi-learned words.

Superimposed upon this contextual system of quantity are certain lengthenings due to specific sound-changes, notably lengthenings before *st* and before *r* + consonant. In the course of the discussion Dr. Flasdieck treats the thorny question of the development of ME. *ēr* in early MnE. at some length, and throws much new light on the problem; but he seems to make unnecessarily heavy going over the close vowel in *pierce* and *fierce*. The view that back vowels were lengthened before a nasal is not accepted; rather, a glide-vowel *u* developed between a nasal and preceding *a* or *o* (the development must have occurred before *o* was raised to *u*). Dr. Flasdieck differs from most other scholars in believing that the velar nasal [ŋ] affected preceding back vowels in the same way as *m* and *n*.

¹ 'Ne. *pint*', *Anglia*, lxxix (1950), 398-405; 'Studien sur Laut- und Wortgeschichte', *Anglia*, lxx (1951), 225-84. His most recent contribution, *Zinn und Zink: Studien zur abendländischen Wortgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1952), does not deal directly with quantity.

² W. Keller, 'Mittelenglische lange Vokale und die altfranzösische Quantität', *Englische Studien*, liv (1920), 111-16.

The vowels of countertonic syllables, whether *vortonig* or *nebentonig*,¹ are found to be short, even before the consonant groups which cause lengthening in tonic syllables. The vexed question of the lengthening of vowels which only came to be stressed in ME. is discussed at length, and the possible influence of a surviving half-stress on the originally tonic syllable is considered. Ultimately, however, the distribution of long and short vowels must remain unexplained: 'warum im Einzelfall auch die Länge verblieb, wird sich wohl auf immer dem forschersichen Zugriff entziehen'.

Dr. Flasdieck explains exceptions to the rules he formulates in a variety of ways: they may be due to the survival of Germanic cognates, to the influence of Latin forms, or to the adoption of spelling pronunciations. The frequency with which spelling pronunciation is invoked is, indeed, one of the chief weaknesses of the book, since few readers will be willing to admit that the present pronunciation of all the following words can be explained in this way: *bat*, *bounty*, *cierge*, *coffer*, *council*, *counsel*, *countenance*, *crucifix*, *crucify*, *Dutch*, *joust*, *letter*, *lunatic*, *offer*, *oust*, *piepowder*, *poesy*, *proffer*, *raffle*, *Roland*, *roll*, *suffer*, *supple*, *tallage*, *tierce*, *torch*, *unicorn*, *unity*.

All students of the English language will be grateful for Dr. Flasdieck's detailed study of an important but neglected aspect of it: the exhaustive collection of materials for the history of individual words and the full references to the literature of the subject will provide an invaluable quarry for future workers in the field. However, the hypotheses put forward involve a number of difficulties which will have to be explained before the general conclusions can be accepted. The view that the OF. lengthening of short vowels was a continuation of the VL. lengthening, and that it followed immediately upon the simplification of double consonants and consonant groups, raises important problems concerned with the *quality* of the lengthened vowels, and in particular of the *e*-sounds. Again, Dr. Flasdieck's view of the development of *a* and *o/u* before nasal consonants is not, on the face it, easy to reconcile with the orthography of Anglo-Norman and ME. manuscripts.

The material of the book is both intricate and extensive, and its presentation is not entirely satisfactory; it is a pity that the useful sub-headings found in the Table of Contents at the end of the book are not repeated in the text. A system of paragraph numbering which involves such complications as 9,283351 does not make it easier to follow up the numerous cross-references. However, the number of actual errors is astonishingly small considering the length and complexity of the work;² proof-reading is admirable, and I have noticed only three minor misprints.³ The indexes are full and accurate.

A. J. BLISS

¹ The value of this distinction is not clear: it is unknown to Romance philologists, and Dr. Flasdieck himself admits no distinction of quantity between the two positions.

² The only serious error is to be found on p. 231, §10,3321, where the first syllable of *ongel* is called countertonic.

³ p. 263, line 34 for *Eckardt* read *Eckhardt*; p. 301, line 33 for *el(a)ttres* read *le(a)ttres*; p. 350, line 17 for *Litchfield* read *Lichfield*.

The Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson. Selected and translated by JEAN I. YOUNG. Introduced by SIGURÐUR NORDAL. Pp. 131. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1954. 10s. 6d. net.

In this new English version of Snorri's *Prose Edda*, designed to meet the needs of university student and general reader, Dr. Young has included the whole of 'The Deluding of Gylfi' and has selected the longer narrative portions from 'Poetic Diction'. Inevitably some important passages of the original had to be left out; but the general reader will not mind, and for the university student the gaps are amply filled by Professor Sigurður Nordal's characteristically concise and lucid Introduction. He has written elsewhere in English on the *Snorra Edda*, in *Corpus Codicum Islandicorum Medii Aevi*, ii (Copenhagen, 1931), but it is always good to see more work of his made available to those who read neither modern Icelandic nor Danish.

There is one regrettable omission from both the Introduction and the Translator's Foreword: no hint is given that Snorri's authorship of *Egils saga Skallagrímssonar* is an eminently reasonable opinion, not established fact. On p. 9 and p. 17 the saga is ascribed to Snorri without any qualification. Few undergraduates (and even fewer general readers) will have read Dr. Nordal's Introduction to his edition of *Egils saga (Íslensk Fornrit*, ii, Reykjavík, 1933) and his *Sagalitteraturen (Nordisk Kultur*, viii B, Uppsala, 1953). Consequently it would have been better to explain a little further—Miss Young could conveniently have done this on p. 17.

Anyone who has tried his own hand at translation knows that the Old Icelandic classics offer many problems, and that Snorri's fluent prose presents special difficulties. Certainly, Miss Young's translation is the best yet published, and in many respects it represents a great advance in technique. At the same time, a translation must be judged by its own standards. This one is meant to provide a 'faithful rendering' for the student, and to achieve 'an interpretation that will not strike the general reader as pedantic' (p. 18). There is, of course, nothing incompatible in these two aims, for the student should learn to make readable translations which are faithful.

Considered from this point of view Miss Young's translation has one obtrusive fault: in too many places its renderings are etymologically exact, but contextually wrong. Icelandic, of all languages, is rich in contextual subtleties, so that what the student needs in a translation is accurate treatment of idiom. Etymology may safely be left to the dictionaries and grammars. There is a good illustration on p. 23: *þá ójafnaðisk mannfólk* is translated as 'inequalities sprang up amongst peoples'. One can only suppose that this rendering was built up from the basic meaning of *jafn*; but it is wrong. What Snorri meant was that as time went on, men became different from each other.

In a work of any length one might pick out words and phrases where a translator fell below his usual standard, and an unjust impression of the whole might easily be given. To minimize this risk two phrases are taken from a passage described by another reviewer as 'so good that it invites a pedant to do his

worst' (*T.L.S.*, 3 June 1955, p. 303). I quote the passage in full because it does illustrate the good things in the translation, as well as the less good.

Concerning Hermóð, however, there is this to tell. For nine nights he rode dales so deep and dark that he saw nothing, until he reached the river Gjöll and rode over its bridge; it is thatched with gleaming gold. The maiden who guards that bridge is called Móðguð. She asked him his name and family and said that the day before five troops of dead men had ridden over the bridge, 'but the bridge resounds as much under you alone, and you don't look like a man who has died. Why are you riding here on the road to Hel?' He replied: 'I must ride to Hel to seek for Baldr. Have you seen anything of him on his way there?' She said that Baldr had ridden past over the bridge of the Gjöll, 'but the road to Hel lies downwards and northwards' (p. 83).

The two phrases are 'for nine nights' and 'I must ride (to Hel)'. They translate *níu nætr* and *ek skal riða* respectively. But *nætr* here means 'days', and to translate it as 'nights' is not only inaccurate *per se*: it obscures Snorri's intention to convey that the valleys through which Hermóð rode were so deep and dark that he could see nothing, even when it was day.

The second point is that *skulu* is like English 'shall': it covers a wide range of meaning, and its senses vary according to the person of the verb. It does not always imply necessity or compulsion. In this context *ek skal riða* is hardly more than simple future, though it may imply determination. Consequently 'I must ride' seems an inappropriate rendering—again, it is too near the etymology. Further, is not the natural English answer 'I am riding'?

These two selected points are no doubt finicky. But it is precisely to settle such points that the student should consult a translation.

Miss Young's touch is sometimes more evidently unsure. For instance on p. 69: 'Thór-the-charioteer was on a journey with his goats and in his chariot and with him the god Loki.' First, this does not read well in English. Secondly, the Icelandic has *fara með* followed first by the accusative, meaning that Thor drove his goats and chariot, and then by the dative, meaning that Loki went with Thor of his own accord. A more accurate and smoother rendering would have been: 'Thor the driver went on a journey, driving his goats and chariot. Loki went with him.'

Some features of the arrangement of the text are unduly distracting. 'Thor the driver' is surely better than 'Thór-the-charioteer', for Thor (without the length-mark) is a well-established English spelling, and normal English practice requires no hyphens in such phrases. Miss Young has also sometimes used square brackets to denote words in her translation but not in the original; these could safely have been omitted.

There is a great demand for good translations from Old Icelandic, and Miss Young has gone a long way towards meeting it: many readers will find her work stimulating and valuable. Yet it lacks that final polish, that confident authority which a translation must have if it is to serve as a model for university students of the language.

H. L. ROGERS

The Wycliffe Bible. By SVEN L. FRISTEDT. Part I: The principal problems connected with Forshall and Madden's edition. Pp. xvi+148 (Stockholm Studies in English 4). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1953. Kr. 18.

There was certainly room for a fresh examination of the materials for the history of the Lollard scripture versions, if only because of the accessibility of more manuscripts and changes in location and methods of study in the course of a century. This first instalment, apparently, of the fruits of Dr. Fristedt's lengthy labours cannot be said fully to have utilized the opportunities or to be thoroughly satisfying, but it does valuable work in reopening several questions of importance and by referring them to the fundamental sources. He starts by stating the elementary but commonly ignored inadequacies of the none-the-less magisterial edition, and of subsequent studies for the most part based solely and uncritically on what it supplies or suppresses, and so vitiated in their arguments if not conclusions. He shows how Forshall's and Madden's practices conceal many textual variations, obliterate differences of dialect, combine diverse sources and complicate their identification. He provides simple apparatus, some hints, and a good deal of example for circumventing these difficulties and correcting the results. He throws serious doubt on the status of some of the crucial copies, including the supposed originals of the Early Version of the Old Testament and Purvey's alleged New Testament, and brings to attention others which suggest an alternative evolution. His hypothesis of a more or less continuous process, or successive stages, of revision has much to recommend it as an explanation of the grouping of renderings and glosses, and the additional readings he adduces, admittedly and unavoidably incomplete, appear to support it amply enough, though further fuller collations are to be desired.

He advances arguments against the belief that the versions reveal a uniform 'Oxford idiom', and persuasively puts the case for a North Midland (Leicestershire) centre of translation, if overstated and spoilt by too great anxiety to retain a link with Wycliffe personally. Dr. Fristedt's review of the claims to authorship is altogether too arbitrary in decision, although he attempts to present the opposing standpoints fairly—so much so that one is sometimes all the more surprised by his summing-up. An excursus into comparative study of the style of one of a group of presumably Lollard pseudo-Augustinian translations (for which he seems to have missed All Souls MS. 24) is also not conspicuously successful. A section on the glossed gospels is one of the more forceful, but unfortunately does not employ Laud misc. 235 nor Lord Dillon's manuscript, the latter actually in the British Museum as Add. 41175 for as long as the present work has been in hand. According to the equally belated *Additional Catalogue* (1950), p. 252, the gloss on St. Matthew in this and the Trinity Cambridge volume used here is, despite common matter and many initial verbal similarities, quite distinct from that in Laud and Add. 28026, the latter also unknown to Fristedt. How far this would affect his views is not obvious to a cursory inspection. There are, besides, other contemporary glosses he has not considered. The relationship of the Lollard and pre-Lollard versions of the Apocalypse, which the late Miss

A. C. Paues had taken up and which it is to be hoped will not be forgotten, is not discussed, but perhaps may come in a subsequent part.

There are a number of very useful photographic specimens of pages of the leading manuscripts described in the study. The English is clear but abrupt and the argument rather repetitive. We should be grateful that Dr. Fristedt has got his material into print and look forward to seeing the remainder soon.

A. I. DOYLE

English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding Drama. By C. S. LEWIS. Pp. vi+696 (Oxford History of English Literature). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954. 30s. net.

This is the most massive of the Oxford Histories of Literature to appear so far. It must be the function of such a history to provide (as it is the common scheme of these Histories to do) a chronological framework and biographical and bibliographical information for those already pretty familiar with the field and, in the 'history', to secure that the already well informed shall be better informed. In addition to these exacting functions, such literary history will have two sources of interest. To those who, in spite of an adverse trend of fashion, still retain a strong sense of history, of sequence and phase, of traditions flowing and intermingling, of fresh impacts, the coming of new men, of revivals and persistences, the great story itself will provide sustenance and stimulus. But literary historians of the calibre of those who make these Histories will not merely place themselves at the service of their story; their history will be critical. Professor Lewis, in a moment of weary deprecation, speaks of the literary historian as a drudge—but he will drudge perceptively, and so the history becomes an evaluation.

This particular history has a strongly individual character and Mr. Lewis's many readers and hearers will perhaps go for the 'Lewisisms' first. It soon becomes apparent that this history conducts one or two major wars, plus a number of minor but serious skirmishes. The first of these wars is against whatever may still linger in the minds of students of English Literature of the old warming notion of a great 'liberating' of the minds of men by 'humanism'. A redistribution of values and interest as between the 'renaissance' (or 'humanism') and the medieval has been in progress for a long time now and consequently when, in his Introduction, 'New Learning and New Ignorance', Professor Lewis declares his war, we know where we are. Nevertheless, it is clear that he considers the enemy has so far been merely scotched; he must be killed. Accordingly, we are shown the fallacy of attributing warmth and glow to the humanist and a tepid formalism to the neo-classic. 'The *Poetica* of Vida is still a central book for Johnson and Pope.' It was the humanists who invented the 'preposterous' notion that 'a thousand years of theology, metaphysics, jurisprudence, courtesy, poetry and architecture' are to be regarded as a mere *media tempestas*, a gap or chasm between them and 'ancient' excellence. If in medieval times the known classics were often misread, the humanists may well have misread and distorted as seriously in their own direction. 'They created a new literary quality—vulgarity.

It is hard to point to any medieval work which is vulgar.' They conducted a war against ideas. The careful reader, however, who will have noted the definition (p. 18) will recall throughout this section of the Introduction that Mr. Lewis's 'humanist' shades from 'grammarian' and will remind himself continually of the scope of these assertions. With the broader, if woollier, meanings of humanism, Mr. Lewis will have nothing to do. With some pride he calls our attention on p. 55 to the fact that 'the word *Renaissance* has not yet occurred in this book'. He deals briefly with its unsatisfactoriness—it imposes a 'factitious unity on all the untidy and heterogeneous events' going on in any period it is used to cover. This, in greater or less degree, is the weakness of all labels, but the prime reason for eschewing 'Renaissance' is characteristic: to do so is to accept the humanists' own evaluation and periodization; they 'were very conscious of living in a *renascentia*. They claimed vociferously to be restoring all good learning, liberating the world from barbarism. . . .' It follows that when Mr. Lewis comes to the Elizabethan florescence with Sidney, Spenser, and Shakespeare, he has no complex of 'movements' and 'isms' handy to 'explain' them. We must fall back on 'genius', plus the added zest of being able to do well what the previous generation tried but could not accomplish.

Another characteristic feature of this History is not exactly a 'war' in the same sense. Mr. Lewis is determined that his readers shall be fully seized of the overwhelming quantitative and qualitative importance in the sixteenth century of its religious preoccupations issuing in written form. Anyone, indeed, who has looked through the *Short Title Catalogue* is aware of the extent to which religious, moral, and utilitarian publications far outnumber what we consider 'literature' in the usual sense. It is also true that many important recent surveys of the 'Elizabethan world outlook' have made the student of the period increasingly aware of the framework of religious and cosmological ideas within which the secular and entertaining existed, and have added enormously to the force and significance of innumerable Elizabethan images and analogies. But these works have been concerned to interpret 'literature' in the light of inherited tradition and contemporary religious preoccupation. The presentation of religious subjects in this History differs in two ways at least. Mr. Lewis occupies himself and his reader at length with the actual religious movements and writings themselves and consequently the early-Tudor Reformation controversies, the Bible and Prayer Book, the Martin Marprelate pamphlet war, and, of course, the *Ecclesiastical Polity* make a very substantial proportion of the book. And secondly, though the material is presented with the historian's responsibility ('I have at least intended to be impartial', p. 157), it conveys also a sense of sharing the original urgency and a delight in the intellectual framework of theology. In other words, it is written from a point of view very much nearer the Elizabethan than obtains in most of the works which set themselves to explain why the Elizabethans are 'different'.

The need for continual attention to Mr. Lewis's definitions, reservations, and applications is also illustrated under the two heads 'Drab' and 'Golden' under which are gathered the sections that make up Books II and III of this History. In general these terms correspond well enough with the usual impression of the

difference between the age of George Turberville and that of Sidney and Spenser, but many readers may experience a shock on meeting Wyatt as the first of the 'Drab' poets. Mr. Lewis is at pains to point out that 'Drab', as he uses it, is 'not a pejorative term' (p. 227). In the same way 'Golden' is not necessarily evaluative—it is descriptive and distinguishing. There can be inferior or trivial 'Golden' verse or prose. The 'Golden' is 'poetry in its innocent—as the theologians would say, its "once-born"—condition' (p. 318). 'With the Golden manner (directed towards richness) there goes, usually, a Golden matter—ideally ardent lovers or ideally heroic wars. . . .' It is obvious that since Book III includes all the non-dramatic writings from c. 1578 to 1603, the golden concept must be flexibly applied. We can take Sidney as *par excellence* the golden poet, yet he had drab contemporaries, and in the increasingly multifarious prose the gold is very unevenly spread. Moreover, as is noted, no sooner is the gold purified and concentrated than whatever element was to be hammered into the 'Metaphysical' was already being mined.

This is by no means an easy book to read. It is, in the full sense, erudite and closely packed. Not inappropriately, perhaps, Mr. Lewis uses a few inkhornisms, and compression, it may be, imposes a certain Saintsburian quality on the style. A history of this kind must give what students expect to find; it must 'cover the ground'. There are, it appears, only limited resources of formulas and devices for introductions, connexions, comparisons, and conclusions when the need for compendiousness is paramount. It is in the heart of the longer paragraphs, at the centre of the topics, that the critic, analyst, and historian can most successfully fuse. It should be stressed that Mr. Lewis, even when under greatest pressure from the historian's duty, never loses his awareness of texture in the work considered—his sense of rhythm, melody, cadence, rhetorical shaping, of the placing and values of words. Hence his high valuation of the Scottish Chaucerians and his refusal to join in some recent efforts to boost their English contemporaries—he cannot away with their broken-backed lines.

'Pageant' or 'panorama' are not analogies to be applied to this survey. We are kept close to the century as it moves along, but it is a literary and intellectual, not a visual, closeness. It will be obvious that the book requires a patient reader if it is to yield its true value as critical history as well as a work of reference. This reviewer has collected pages of notes, comments, queries, and some reservations, and has marked marginally as many more—these marginal notes include many enthusiastic 'ticks'. Only three specimen reservations can be noted here. Is there not something more to be said for Lyly the 'novelist' (especially as the author of *Euphues and his England*) than Mr. Lewis will concede? The sections on *Astrophel and Stella* are stimulating, but some may wonder whether, in the entirely laudable determination to cut away from biographical 'sincerity', the baby has not been thrown out with the bath water. Bacon only comes into the century surveyed by virtue of the little volume of 1597 and is rightly only touched on in the Epilogue. If his English prose were more relevant and if space permitted, I could be moved to pick a little quarrel here.

G. D. WILLCOCK

Il Teatro di John Marston. By GIULIANO PELLEGRINI. Pp. 219. Pisa: Libreria Goliardica Editrice, 1952. L. 2,200.

Barocco Inglese. By GIULIANO PELLEGRINI. Pp. 247. Messina; Firenze: d'Anna, 1953. L. 1,800.

This careful study of John Marston assembles and presents the views of many earlier students. In the first part of the work, two biographical chapters rely largely on the work of Brettell and the various historians of the War of the Theatre, while Chapter III summarizes the views of critics from A. W. Schlegel to T. S. Eliot. Pellegrini applies Eliot's view that Marston turned unwillingly to the stage after the ban on satiric writings had deprived him of his chosen form, and that his development is a matter of acclimatizing himself. In Part II, where the plays are examined in detail, the weakness of *Antonio and Mellida* is contrasted with the strength of its successor, *Antonio's Revenge*. Passing fairly rapidly over the lesser plays of the War, Pellegrini reaches Marston's one masterpiece of character drawing, *The Dutch Courtesan*. He does full justice to the heroine, and perhaps rather more than justice to some of the lesser parts, as when the unfortunate attempt to portray feminine frankness in Crispinella, which seems to foreshadow Swift at his nastiest, is justified by the need for dramatic contrast. The strength of Pellegrini lies in his power to suggest the variety of Marston's style, and the contrasts between one play and another; but he seems in his cool and rational appraisal to miss the passion of self-torment which is the abiding quality of all that the poet wrote.

In *The Malcontent*, to which he devotes a separate chapter, Pellegrini sees the final unification of Marston the dramatist and Marston the satirist, so that the play becomes both poetically and theatrically centred in the person of the hero. The minor characters fall into their right proportions when seen as foils to Malevole.

Marston's remaining plays are then considered, with *Sophonisba* appearing the logical, though not the actual, conclusion to his dramatic development. He is seen primarily as an experimenter, and the remarkable quality of his work to lie in its diversity, a diversity which none the less is controlled by Marston's impress of his own personality upon all that he wrote.

Pellegrini's clear, smooth exposition provides an admirable introduction to the plays, and should make for a wider knowledge in a country where Marston must be little more than a name. The English reader would find it a useful book of reference. It is to be regretted that Pellegrini did not provide some comparison between Marston and the Italian satirists of the Renaissance. Marston's mother was of an Italian family, he knew the language, and it is possible that the social and political ascendancy of such a figure as Aretino may have influenced Marston in his youth; his strong disclaimers of ambition are a little too persistent not to arouse suspicion.

In his work on Baroque, Pellegrini begins by summarizing critical views on this subject, and goes on to consider the work of Beaumont and Fletcher and Massinger, more particularly *The Virgin Martyr*, to which a separate essay is devoted. Here again, he is concerned to explain and introduce the baroque quality in tragi-comedy, the emotional virtuosity of Beaumont and Fletcher, and

their relation to the courtly taste of the day. The English reader will be most interested in the essay on Massinger's debt to Italy. Pellegrini concludes that in sympathetic depiction of Italy Massinger stands alone among his contemporaries.

M. C. BRADBROOK

Tillotson. A Study in Seventeenth Century Literature. By LOUIS G. LOCKE.

Pp. 187 (Anglistica 4). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954. Kr. 23.00.

As a sermon-writer lacking the metaphysical intensity of Donne and Andrewes on the one hand, and the baroque excesses of Jeremy Taylor on the other, Tillotson has suffered proportionately more neglect than the other literary churchmen of the seventeenth century. He was, however, a popular London preacher for thirty years following the Restoration, and enjoyed a reputation for eloquence scarcely exceeded by any other preacher of the century. He played a part not merely in spreading the new latitudinarian 'Whig' theology that was now taking the place of the old enthusiasms, but also in providing a model for writers of all kinds who were seeking a rational and restrained style for expository prose, in short all the writers who had correctly discerned the tone proper for the new age.

The pulpit was still a sufficiently central feature of the national life to give a lead of this sort. 'We need to remember', writes Mr. Locke, 'that Tillotson's contemporaries, excepting a few rakes, heard more sermons than plays, or for that matter, more sermons than anything else.' Dryden's tribute to Tillotson as the one to whom he was chiefly indebted for any talent he might have as a prose writer is well known. Mr. Locke wisely notes that Dryden might have exaggerated—he could afford to be magnanimous—but however this might be, there can be no doubt of the importance of Tillotson's literary influence. Mr. Locke points out and illustrates Tillotson's link with the essayists, especially the journalistic essayists of the following century. Indeed, Tillotson's real significance for literary history belongs to the eighteenth rather than the seventeenth century, and the most valuable portion of Mr. Locke's book is that devoted to his eighteenth-century reputation. From Steele (*Spectator*, 103) to Hugh Blair (*Lectures on Rhetoric*) he is esteemed as the great exemplar of sincerity in prose, and this praise is echoed by authors of textbooks and editors of anthologies throughout that century.

On the other hand, Mr. Locke is less helpful in pointing out Tillotson's seventeenth-century provenance. His style has a detailed connexion with that of the Puritans, the Senecan essayists, and the scientific writers, which does not emerge clearly from Mr. Locke's thesis. He shows that Tillotson is unlike Thomas Browne; his resemblance to Ames and Baxter would have been more to the point, however. Taine's criticism of Tillotson's style as desiccated and scholastic, and of his mind as a heavy reasoning machine lacking passion and subtlety, is rather too quickly dismissed as 'shameless misrepresentation'. Taine, it is true, was unsympathetic, or else he might have seen something of Tillotson's manly vigour, but the heavy-handed tabulation of arguments, the endless dichotomies, and the complacent fashion in which all mysteries are dispatched, must surely be evident to the non-prejudiced reader of Tillotson and are all too clearly

in the tradition of the Puritan 'saints', employing their cumbersome Ramist method and the 'logic' of predestination.

Doctrinally, of course, Tillotson had little sympathy for Puritanism; he had left all that behind him with the Restoration, if not earlier, and had turned instead to the natural religion of Chillingworth, with a good dash of Jeremy Taylor and the Platonists. Mr. Locke touches briefly on this latter association and points out that Tillotson had enjoyed the proximity of Cudworth, Whichcot, Smith, and More, during his Cambridge days, and had acquired some of their moderation and temperance. On the other hand, there is certainly a world of difference between the rationalism of Henry More and that of Tillotson, though they were both in reaction against the same forms of unreason. Here one would have welcomed a slightly fuller treatment.

What emerges from Mr. Locke's summary of Tillotson's life and works is a portrait of a prudent, unenthusiastic, 'middle-class' divine; the middle-class streak (not unconnected, surely, with his Puritanism) is possibly the key to the rest. There is not a little of the Defoe about him; it comes out in the utilitarian, indeed commercial, flavour of some of his ethical advice:

our main interest is to be as happy as we can, and as long as it is possible . . . the best wisdom is to choose the greatest and most lasting happiness, but the least and shortest misery. . . . This is the wisdom of religion, that upon consideration of the whole, and casting up all things together, it does advise and lead us to our best interest.

Mr. Locke's work lacks, however, the salt of criticism. He is perhaps a shade too anxious to present Tillotson as the good and liberal dean and consequently tends to overlook or obscure his shortcomings. Among other things, Tillotson, when all has been said to explain the inevitability of his various changes of allegiance and the arguments which he doubtless used to justify them to his conscience, was something of a trimmer. His letter to Lord Russell advising him on his soul's salvation to acknowledge obediently the absolute authority of Charles II hardly reads well in the light of his own later decision to rescind his oath to James, acclaim William as the glorious saviour of the Church, and accept the Archbishopric of Canterbury whilst the non-juring Sancroft was still alive. There is no room left now for indignation at these long-passed minor scandals of seventeenth-century church history, but a gentle irony would not be out of place.

Mr. Locke's work is scholarly but pedestrian; it usefully depicts Tillotson for the literary student and, in a broader sense, helps to show how the values of the seventeenth century were transmitted to the eighteenth. Unfortunately, there are rather more misprints and misquotations than one would expect in a learned monograph of this kind; some are no doubt due to the book having been set up by a foreign-speaking compositor; but one cannot overlook serious copying errors. On p. 70 nine words are omitted in a quotation from Tillotson, and on p. 110 ten words are somehow lost in an extract from McGiffert's *Protestant Thought before Kant*. In both cases, the sense suffers. Incidentally, one is surprised not to find mention in either the text or the bibliography of Tulloch's two-volume *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*.

HAROLD FISCH

John Bunyan. By ROGER SHARROCK. Pp. 163. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1954. 8s. 6d. net.

Bunyan's work occupies the difficult terrain between literature and dogma, 'a wide field full of dark mountains' like the one that so oddly breaks into the rural scene of his greatest book. Mr. Sharrock is faced with the problem of prospecting it for readers whom he expects to be ignorant both of the ethos of the seventeenth century and of the theology of Calvin; and his difficulty is increased by the fact that the material upon which he is working was never intended by its author to be measured by literary standards. The application of such standards *in vacuo* gives too great prominence to *The Pilgrim's Progress*, and a false picture of it; on the other side, a purely doctrinal approach leads to uncritical piety, or equally uncritical denigration.

Mr. Sharrock adopts a safe, sound compromise of exposition which retreats from making any judgement of the Puritan position. It is not his business to defend Bunyan's theology, only to expound it and elucidate its bearing upon the allegories to which it gave rise. This he does with exemplary clarity and detachment, putting each work firmly in the context of its author's thought, pointing out its literary merits, discussing its literary defects, and altogether giving a useful conspectus of Bunyan's performance. The analysis of *Grace Abounding* faces squarely the interpretation of modern psychology without allowing this to be the whole truth; the resemblances of *Mr. Badman* to the novels of Defoe are indicated only that the differences may be appreciated; the change of tone in the second part of *The Pilgrim's Progress* is illuminated by the history of Bunyan's pastoral experience with the Bedford meeting. Such points are not new, but they are made skilfully and effectively.

Where the method seems less successful is in its application to the books which have still a universal appeal. Paradoxically, the caution observed in dealing with the theology here defeats its own end, and one feels that if Mr. Sharrock had been braver and tackled the implications as well as the content of the dogma, he would have given us the Bunyan that belongs to mankind as well as the sectary. He says, for instance,

Bunyan's good and evil are our good and evil, however harsh and strange the shapes of damnation and election which his vision assumes. What does mark him off is the plunge into faith that he makes.

This is certainly true, yet without some assessment of the quality of that faith as an account of human experience the art of *Grace Abounding* and *The Pilgrim's Progress* cannot be fully understood. What, surely, distinguishes Calvinism as it is expressed in the *Institutes* and as it was experienced by Bunyan, is the intensely tragic quality of its conception of the human situation, its metaphysical implications. The theology may be, as Mr. Sharrock says, 'outmoded'. So is that of the Greeks. What remains is the image of man and his destiny it has created. The 'theological ground-plot' of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, which Mr. Sharrock traces as it follows the pattern of the spiritual autobiography, is also its imaginative ground-plot; and if we do not recognize this, we shall not recognize such things

as Evangelist's speech to the pilgrims before Vanity Fair and the relentless ending of the story for the artistic triumphs that they are.

Mr. Sharrock has done so much in a small compass that it is perhaps ungracious to raise this objection. The strength of his book is its balanced treatment of the man and his work, and this could not have been achieved without close familiarity with Bunyan's cultural background. Extensive reading in the unrewarding wastes of Puritan prose lies behind the quotations and unobtrusive allusions ('they discoursed of tabernacles and fiery flying rolls'), but Mr. Sharrock never labours information for information's sake. His knowledge is always at the service of criticism, and is particularly valuable in explaining points of allegorical detail. Two small errors need correction: it was not Greatheart but Mr. Valiant-for-Truth for whom the trumpets sounded (p. 103), and Guyon did not 'fall to rise again' in the Cave of Mammon (p. 89).

ROSEMARY FREEMAN

Swift and the Church of Ireland. By LOUIS A. LANDA. Pp. xvi+206. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954. 21s. net.

Whereas it would seem pedantic to speak of Dean Donne, the author of *Gulliver's Travels* is commonly known by his decanal title. It is minimal knowledge about Swift that he was Dean of St. Patrick's in Dublin, a dignity which, as Monck Mason put it, 'his name has rendered illustrious to all nations, and through all future ages'. Swift was by profession and conviction a clergyman. He was in orders for fifty years and Dean of St. Patrick's for thirty-two of them, becoming in the latter half of his career the most renowned ecclesiastic of the Irish Church. Writing was never his profession, was perhaps not even his main interest and, significantly, all that he wrote had the practical end in view of shaping the events of his time. Much of it was written in support of the established church, which he served so devotedly. The mistaken view has often been refuted that Swift's heart was not in his ministry except in so far as it fostered his ambitions and provided him with a maintenance, but Professor Landa is the first to give us, in this impeccable study, a full and searching account, not of Swift's religious beliefs (which have been treated by others), but of his career as a great administrator in the Church of Ireland.

The author has used many new documents with the thoroughness and the mastery of detail exhibited in his previous researches into the economic and ecclesiastical background of Swift's Irish writings. He has worked through obscure pamphlets, he has sifted the correspondence of Archbishops Boulter, King, and Wake, and the letters in the Gilbert Collection in Dublin, and he has minutely examined the chapter minutes of St. Patrick's and other ecclesiastical records, obtaining the clearest illumination of his subject from all. It was largely owing to Swift, it can be added, that these cathedral records were properly preserved. The stages in Swift's rise are unfolded, authoritatively and absorbingly, from his first obscure position as prebendary of Kilroot, through his office of domestic chaplain to Lord Berkeley and vicar of Laracor, to his appointment, when his hopes of higher office in England had been disappointed, as dean of the greatest cathedral in Ireland. Swift was never to rise to higher rank in

the Church but, asserting the prerogatives of his office against a hostile Whig opposition within his own chapter, he gave a new distinction to the position and made it the base of his struggles to defend a constantly threatened establishment. To that end he had to resist government pressure and the encroachment of dissenters and to rally the lower clergy against an overbearing prelacy.

As the church of a privileged minority, closely linked to an alien English government, the Irish establishment depended on its privilege and its property to maintain its supremacy among a population composed mainly of Roman Catholics and dissenters. Yet the gentry, who should have been its firmest supporters, were constantly weakening it by their endeavours to enrich themselves with its property. Its poverty, especially when compared with the English Church, gave a sense of insecurity and grievance to its clergy and was looked upon as the source of its spiritual weakness. This miserable condition of the Irish Church was Swift's constant concern, and much of Landa's book is in consequence given up to an examination of its decayed temporalities, its reduced tithes, the impropriations, the declining rents from Church lands, and the way these economic difficulties produced such inconveniences and evils as pluralism and non-residence. The part Swift played is made admirably clear and in explaining it the complexities, historical, economic, administrative, and political, are finely unravelled. One misses only an account of Swift's conduct of his humbler but more genuinely religious pastoral duties, but that can be found in other books. Swift's views on Church matters are shown to be typical rather than unusual, the effectiveness of his intervention arising from the forceful statement he gave to his views, the tenacity with which he maintained them, and the courage with which he laboured to halt the decline in the spiritual effectiveness of the Church. Landa demonstrates beyond disputing that when in 1736, near the end of his career, Swift gloomily proclaimed 'I have long given up all hopes of Church and Christianity', he was not cynically expressing religious unbelief but acknowledging realistically his ultimate failure to check this decay in the church he so greatly valued.

In the course of his study Landa demolishes a few legends about Swift and makes some important revisions of the accepted facts. Here are some of the more important. Contrary to the impression promulgated by Sir Walter Scott, Swift never resided regularly at Laracor. Again, his own confident reminiscence of how, early in his career, he was cheated of the deanery of Derry is shown to be without foundation, or almost so. There is a full disclosure of the shabby behaviour of the bishops towards him in the matter of obtaining the remission of First Fruits. Most biographers, it is now clear, have been wrong in suggesting that Swift soon got the upper hand of his chapter; on the contrary he could never be sure of its co-operation until after 1730, though he badly needed its loyalty in his continued resistance to the power of the bishops. The bishops of the Irish Church were not a particularly distinguished set of dignitaries and they had no reason to favour Swift, who constantly suspected their Whiggish motives. Nevertheless, his suspicion was at times excessive and Landa has done justice to the more honourable motives of the bishops, which Swift at times ignored or perverted. When they supported 'those two abominable Bills, for enslaving and

begging the Clergy', one empowering the bishops to compel the clergy to build manses on part of their glebes, the other to divide large parishes, Swift represented their action as 'a premeditated design, from the spirit of ambition and love of arbitrary power, to make the whole body of the clergy their slaves and vassals'. But it can be said for the bishops that, tactless and arrogant as was their way of going about it, they were genuinely trying to lessen the scandal of non-residence among the lower clergy, though admittedly ignoring their own uncanonical practices. As the evidence shows, Swift was not invariably to be found in the party opposing the bishops. He cannot be accused of factiousness, much less of petty malice and personal resentment. On the few occasions when he was convinced that the bishops were in the right and acting for the good of the Church, it was he who supplied the most convincing exposition of their case. So it was in the contest with the lay landlords over the tithe of agistment, which he at once recognized as a challenge to the historical claim of the clergy to hold their tithes as legal property rights. It was the same again with the dispute over the Bill of 1733 to encourage the linen industry at the expense of Church tithes. On this occasion Swift was outstandingly zealous in defending the property of the Church because the Bill would have most benefited Ulster, the centre of the linen industry and the stronghold of Presbyterianism, and consequently the region where the Church would be most dangerously weakened by a diminution of its revenues. It is a point of emphasis that Landa overlooks. To choose only one more of the matters which Landa sets right, the staggering misinterpretation as an attack on the bishops of Swift's *Some Arguments against enlarging the Power of Bishops in Letting of Leases* (1723), long perpetuated by a whole succession of scholars, is completely disposed of. The bishops, as Swift acknowledged with approval, did not want these powers, which the laity were trying to foist upon them as another of their schemes to obtain Church lands on more profitable long leases and at cheaper rents. With Archbishop King, for the most part his toughest opponent, Swift had much in common, particularly when it came to championing the Irish interest against exploitation from England. We have not before had such a finely discriminating study of the tactical engagements and occasional tacit alliances between the two greatest personalities in the Irish Church of that day.

The importance of this book should now be sufficiently obvious. It supplies for many of Swift's Irish writings precisely the kind of interpretation we have long needed, and it will suggest fresh interests in our reading of some of his other pieces, *Examiner* No. 43, for instance, where he appealed early on for an improvement in the stipends of the clergy, at the same time warning them, with his shrewd economic sense, against accepting fixed rents because of the continual depreciation in the purchasing power of money. There is surprisingly little about religion in *Gulliver's Travels*, but the study of Swift's clerical career gives added piquancy to the King of Brobdingnag's observations upon the appointment of bishops and 'slavish prostitute Chaplains'. Above all, this inquiry helps materially in the assessment of Swift's character and motives. By all the evidence he was a man permanently out of luck, one who had continually to watch lesser men preferred above him. But it is not difficult to deduce explanations. Clearly his

superiors distrusted his temper and resented his assumption of personal superiority, even as they feared his abilities and unflinching courage. He felt the insidious lure of power, more keenly in fact than Landa allows, though none was fitted to use authority more justly. The epithets that Landa applies to him, 'conscientious' and 'formidable', are indeed fully substantiated. As a cleric he was hardly less great than as a writer, and it was by mastery of practical affairs as much as by force of character that he dominated in both vocations. The bishopric he once coveted could have added nothing to his importance.

Professor Landa's book is the most important addition to the historical biography of Swift that we have had since the letters to Ford were published by Professor Nichol Smith in 1935. It should be no less valuable, one judges, for its contribution to the economic and ecclesiastical history of Ireland. In every respect it is a model of industrious and enlightened research.

COLIN J. HORNE

The Early Irish Stage. By WILLIAM SMITH CLARK. Pp. xii+227. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 30s. net.

The publication of this book must give great satisfaction to those interested in the Irish theatre and drama, and hardly less to all students of stage history. For William Smith Clark, in making a survey of the Irish stage from the beginning to 1720, has given a continuous and coherent account of the slow growth of Irish theatrical art and the development of a theatrically educated audience, which has long been needed. For most readers the significant period in Irish theatre history begins in 1899, when Yeats and Lady Gregory set going the movement that not long after produced the Abbey Theatre. And there is some justification for this view, for not till then did the National Movement begin and Irish playwrights write on Irish subjects for Irish actors and Irish audiences. For it is one of the peculiarities of Ireland's literary history that it had a famous theatre 200 years or more before it had a drama, and though, by the time Yeats began to build up its drama, it had long lost that theatre, and the Ancient Concert Rooms in Molesley Street but ill supplied the place of the once brilliant Theatre Royal in Smock Alley, there is good reason for regarding a theatre movement as adult only when it becomes dramatically self-supporting. One of the functions of Clark's history is to show how the relations between Dublin and London in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century and the social implications of the English Ascendancy steadily drained away to the London theatres not only the best actors trained in Ashbury's famous nursery of acting, but also a series of promising Irish dramatists (of whom Southerne, Congreve, and Farquhar are among the best known), thus giving seeming support to the assumption that the theatre was not indigenous in Ireland.

But in fact, as the author makes clear, the love of drama had been inherent in the Irish people from a very early date, and once the geographical closeness of the London theatres and the supposed superiority of London as a social centre are taken into account—and due allowance made for the surprising number of brilliant London dramatists of Irish birth—it becomes clear that the long

minority of the Irish stage is the product rather of peculiar political conditions than of an inherently undramatic habit of mind, such as serves to explain the relative dearth of native dramatists in one or two continental countries which also have had famous theatres. When, therefore, one has accepted these implications in Clark's evidence, some difference is made not only to one's knowledge of Irish theatre history before 1720 but also to one's understanding of the present Irish dramatic movement and of the probable depth of its roots. It has sometimes been suggested that Yeats imposed that movement, by sheer force of genius, on a people essentially undramatic in taste. But its continued life and widening ramifications have tended more and more to refute this suggestion, and now comes evidence, from a quite different direction, that lends support to our confidence in the future of the Irish drama.

The story of the Irish theatre before 1720 falls naturally into three parts, of which the first two are but introductory: the medieval phase, the brief life of the first Dublin theatre before the English Civil War, and the long period of growing fame and prosperity that dates from the Restoration to the death of Ashbury in 1720. For the medieval period and the sixteenth century (Chap. I, 'The Beginnings') the evidence is slender, but it is enough to indicate at first phases comparable with those of the rest of Europe and later the emergence in the early seventeenth century of Dublin and Kilkenny as the natural, though by no means the only, centres of theatrical activity, with Trinity College making a contribution comparable to that of certain continental universities. The next step came with the building of John Ogilby's theatre in St. Werburgh Street, Dublin, under the patronage of Lord Deputy Wentworth in 1637. Here, until the outbreak of the English Civil War, Ogilby offered to the gentry and government coterie of Dublin a repertoire similar to that of contemporary London, and here appear the first plays, such as Shirley's *St. Patrick*, which begin to draw upon Irish material.

But the main body of the book is given over, and rightly, to the author's clear and continuous account of the growth and development of the Dublin stage after the Restoration, at first under Ogilby again and then under Ashbury. To this period, from 1660 to 1720, belongs the career of the Smock Alley Theatre, well known in London as a training ground for actors, whether Irish or English, and for promising young dramatists, nearly all, like Farquhar, to be assimilated by Drury Lane or Lincoln's Inn Fields. Here belongs, too, the story of the expansion of Dublin, of the growth of a fashionable life closely comparable with that of London, and of the position of the Smock Alley Theatre as one of the centres of social and cultural activity. It is a story parts of which were known to all students of the stage from their reading of Chetwood and other eighteenth-century theatre chroniclers, but never before set out in detail and with scholarly accuracy. For in this book sound scholarly technique has worked upon a mass of heterogeneous material, ranging from, at one extreme, the enchanting, vivid, and sometimes maddeningly inaccurate contemporary accounts (such as are familiar to all workers in theatre history) to, at the other, the archives preserved in the Public Record Office in London, the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and similar bodies, supplemented by Smock Alley prompt books and other documents preserved in the Folger Shakespeare Library,

Harvard University Library, and other repositories in Europe and the United States. Some of this material has already been examined with special aspects in view, and Clark draws attention to a number of recent articles that offer valuable findings in specific and limited areas of the field. Conspicuous among these is that of W. J. Lawrence, the full value of whose 'Notebooks for a history of the Irish Stage'¹ is driven home to us by the grim iteration of acknowledgements in some such form as, 'Transcripts made by W. J. Lawrence in 1909 from documents in the Public Record Office, Dublin, destroyed by fire in 1922'. The corresponding entries in the Bibliography bear the same testimony.

Methods such as Clark's serve to clear up discrepancies and errors not only in contemporary historians but in some more recent writers in this field; corrections in dating, ascription, and identification are to be found scattered throughout the footnotes, as evidence drawn from one group of sources is brought to bear upon another and traditional assumptions tested. The book leaves an impression of detailed scrutiny applied at every stage of the investigation without in any way diminishing the author's evident concern for the fair repute of the early Irish theatre or his ability to reveal throughout his story the deeply inherent dramatic instinct of the Irish people, often but obliquely revealed.

There are four important appendices, comprising documents, lists of productions, and lists of actors.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

Coleridge, *Opium and Kubla Khan*. By ELISABETH SCHNEIDER. Pp. xi+378.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953; London: Cambridge University Press, 1954. 37s. 6d. net.

This is the most valuable and interesting book on Coleridge for many years. One can say at once that Professor Schneider's presentation of her argument is lucid and refreshingly light-hearted, and that the notes, references, and the excellent index exhibit her usual scholarly thoroughness.

Of the many important issues raised in her book, the two most central to her argument will be considered here. The first two chapters of her book are largely concerned with discrediting what can be conveniently termed the 'opium myth' (that 'Kubla Khan' is unique in its technique and verbal effects and derives its uniqueness from the circumstances of its composition). The opium myth has determined the form of the two main schools of criticism of the poem. One stems from Lowes and affirms that the poem is a glorious magical sequence of dream-images, 'as aimless as it is magnificent' (to use Lowes's own phrase), and that it is beyond the reach of criticism. The other, in reaction to this veneration of the poem's assumed meaninglessness, attempts to find a meaning conveyed symbolically by its imagery. The dependence of both schools on the myth is clearly demonstrated. By disposing of the myth itself, Miss Schneider attempts to show the inadequacy of the Lowes approach, the irrelevance of the symbolist, and to prepare the way for her own interpretation of the poem. The form her criticism of it takes seems to imply that her interpretation (the main reason for her book) cannot be easily accepted unless the myth has been shown to be false in the light

¹ In the University of Cincinnati Library, Cincinnati, Ohio.

of modern ideas on addiction and the poem proved to be a product not of Coleridge's 'dreaming' (whatever its nature) but of his waking consciousness. Miss Schneider's handling of the medical evidence here could not be better. The symptoms of addiction, according to recently gained knowledge, are such that we can no longer relate them in any way to the verbal characteristics of 'Kubla Khan'. Addicts in fact do not normally dream, so the poem's imagery cannot be peculiarly dream-like or dream-derived, and Coleridge's account of its composition must be untrue. Miss Schneider's procedure here, valid and thorough as far as it goes, leaves unharmed an underlying assumption of the myth: that there is a significant creative relationship between the production of vivid dream-images by the poet (we can only assert that Coleridge's dreams were not induced by opium, not that he did not dream at all) and the production of vivid verbal images. Certainly, for readers of the nineteenth century and many of the twentieth, the special kind of poetic magic the poem is supposed to throw off is tied up in a direct way with Coleridge's opium habits and with the manner of its composition. But some of us have felt able to accept Coleridge's account of the genesis of the poem as being substantially true without feeling committed to any particular critical attitude to his poem or to thinking of it as unique. There are other instances of works of literature and music being 'given' to the artist in whole or part, good or bad, while his attention was elsewhere; we do not have to think Coleridge confused or a liar unless what he says is clearly impossible. We can agree with Miss Schneider that this unfinished poem is not remarkably dissimilar in technique to much other verse of the period, including some of Coleridge's own, but it is not necessary to explode an opium myth in order to believe or say so. Whether the poem was composed in some kind of dream-state or not is irrelevant to a discussion of its value and type. Dream imagery as material for a poem is on the same level as other material; it cannot of itself condition the value and nature of the poetic product. Dreaming (making mental images) and writing poetry (making verbal images) are two different and independent kinds of activity. Characteristically, Coleridge himself is first guilty of trailing this critical red herring, which is of the same type as, say, the blindness of Milton (rarely absent from a discussion of his imagery) or the deafness of Beethoven. We must be very grateful to Miss Schneider for clearing up in this interesting and scholarly way all our confusions and misconceptions about addiction and its relevance to the study of literature, though I feel the underlying confusion could have been more adequately dealt with.

As she will not allow Coleridge his dream or 'reverie', Miss Schneider has to explain away as best she can his Preface and the reference to the poem in the Crewe manuscript. Her suggestion that his account is based on a confused memory of a rather similar experience told of 'Perdita' Robinson (mistakenly transferred by Coleridge to himself) and his well-known dream which represented 'visually and audibly' the whole of *Paradise Lost*, as well as some stray memories of the *Phaedo* and the *Ion*, seems to be more unlikely than the poet's own.

The remainder of the book, in which 'Kubla Khan' is discussed in relation to other poems of the same period and finally itself sensitively commented upon, is

beyond praise. Miss Schneider demonstrates that the poem is not an isolated or unique literary phenomenon (is not of 'virgin birth' as the Lowes school affirm), but is one product of a literary tradition gaining strength about the middle of the eighteenth century (though sending its roots back as far as Milton) and continuing into the early decades of the nineteenth. The imagery, vocabulary, and general situation of the poem belong to a tradition of oriental tales in verse in which fountains, domes, caverns, damsels with dulcimers, magicians, the building of paradises, and other properties of 'Kubla Khan' are poetic formulas or common-places. In theme and treatment 'Kubla Khan' strikingly resembles 'Gebir', Southey's 'Thalaba', and Sotheby's translation of Wieland's 'Oberon'. These three works she mentions as being verbally the closest to Coleridge's poem and also most representative of this minor tradition itself. By placing the poem in its historical context Miss Schneider establishes the type of poem that it is and therefore the kind of criticism that can be relevantly brought to it. The need for any symbolic interpretation disappears once the poem is replaced in its literary setting. As in 'Gebir' or 'Thalaba', the dome, fountain, cave, are merely exciting romantic poetic formulas with no significance beyond their literal one.

The parallels between 'Gebir', 'Thalaba', and 'Kubla Khan' are so close as to raise the question whether Coleridge could have seen them before writing his own poem. There is no direct evidence for a later dating of the poem (to autumn 1799 or summer 1800), but the amount of indirect evidence for one or other of these dates seems to me to be much more persuasive than Miss Schneider herself is willing to admit. The evidence of the poem itself, its style, versification, and imagery, is so tactfully and sensitively handled by her that it weighs much more heavily than such suspect evidence normally does and more than much of her external evidence. It is not essential to her argument and critical appreciation of the poem that it should have been written at a later date. She has produced an admirable piece of critical elucidation in recreating the poem for us in its literary context, and here questions of influences and sources are not vitally important.

Miss Schneider's critical comments on the poem are sensitive and often new in respect of its verbal pattern and technique, robust and sensible in respect of its meaning. She does not claim to be wholly original in saying that the last eighteen lines refer in a straightforward manner to the poet's inability to complete his intended poem, though her remarks gain enormously in validity in the context of her main argument. The combination throughout of accurate scholarship, common sense, humour, and sensitive literary appreciation is most gratifying.

J. P. MANN

Thackeray the Novelist. By GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Pp. xvi+312. Cambridge: University Press, 1954. 22s. 6d. net.

Professor Tillotson has written a welcome book which is not easy to review. The revived interest in nineteenth-century studies has not reached Thackeray's novels, though his life and letters continue to receive undiminished attention. For various reasons, some foolish, some merely fashionable, the younger reader has not been induced by George Saintsbury's still unsurpassed 'considerations'

of the novelist he loved and understood so intimately to read further than the inevitable school exercise of *Esmond* or *Vanity Fair*. Literary biography and editorial labours are but pious means to a single desired end, the reading of the five great novels. For two-thirds of its length this new study is closely concerned with this desideratum, and it may well accomplish what Saintsbury's best book failed to achieve. Mr. Tillotson has caught the current fashion for intellectual analysis to some effect and offers as pabulum (or bait?) a close criticism of the novels, abounding in long quotations and supported by a proliferation of sub-sections. He successfully gives the impression that Thackeray can survive the most rigorous scrutiny.

The unity of the world of Thackeray's novels is patiently expounded in the first five chapters; in particular, Chapter Four on the 'authorial "I"' and Chapter Five on the novelist's conduct of his commentary uncover the very heart of Thackeray's method. A precise definition of the 'authorial "I"' is finely drawn and the essential tasks which confront critics of Thackeray are clearly stated. The writer's own view is exemplary: 'If we read his novels at all, we must read every word of them.' Even so, are the long quotations used to illustrate 'the action in the commentary' really necessary? And is it fair to Thackeray to discuss the variety of his style as a mere bridge passage or—a complementary error this—to dismiss the minor works, even momentarily, in half a page?

Chapter Six on 'The Author's Truthfulness of Personage and Action' occupies a fifth of the book; all novelists 'who have the power to make us accept their creatures as actual' are praised and *Dennis Haggarty's Wife* is acclaimed 'as fine and powerful as anything in Thackeray'. (This judgement would form a significant point of departure for any wilfully destructive reviewer of Mr. Tillotson's book.) Some readers may find the cavalier treatment of 'time' a little unsatisfactory. Here he seems to hint—he is more explicit later—that the yellowing action of time is part of the present-day reader's satisfaction in reading the novels, and that the novelist experienced (and communicated as an essential ingredient?) a similar feeling in, say, *Esmond*. This 'time problem' is concealed beneath all Thackerayan commentary. His is mid-Victorian commentary even in *Esmond* and *The Virginians*; and while we discard the dated trimmings we retain still the freshness of the commentary on 'general humanity' despite its old-fashioned, that is its mid-Victorian, nature. For no normal person, however sensitive, really believes that he knows Colonel Newcome or Becky Sharp. Surely only characters in our exactly contemporary fiction have the power to excite us by their definable similarity to people we know. As an artist the novelist, like the poet and the dramatist, claims no exemption from the compulsion to shape his novels in terms which are symbolic of his own and his contemporaries' need for apprehensions of reality. So that any novel worth the study, deeply committed as it must be to an interest in character, is even more profoundly concerned with the interplay between the forces and choices which help to mould character. These forces and choices are rendered explicit and presented to the contemporary reader in terms familiar to the novelist and his public even when, *pace* Lord David Cecil, the novelist's 'range' apparently confines his selection of subject-matter to the day before yesterday. This stricture apart,

Mr. Tillotson's handling of 'truthfulness to personage' is cleanly and aptly controlled to illustrate, in the critic's happy phrase, 'the humane fullness of Thackeray's practice'. From these sixty pages nearly a score of aphorisms could be selected, each one hitting off a significant trait in the novelist's writing.

The last chapter, constituting one-third of the book, discusses Thackeray's 'philosophy'; at one point in his argument Mr. Tillotson confesses that 'if we wish to summarize the essentials of Thackeray's philosophy, they do not make much of a show'. To adapt another of his comments, the twenty sections of this one-hundred-page chapter form not a philosophy but 'a bundle of instances of his thoughts' on society, sermonizing, 'the world of all of us', the author and human frailty, the indecisive moralist, and, lastly and triumphantly, 'the core of truth'. Even more than the earlier part this final chapter is overloaded with quotations and contains, like them, many just observations conveyed in memorable phrases: 'What we honour in Thackeray is our own mind at a finer pitch, working on our experience widened and deepened'; 'What was strong in him was the endurance of his sensitiveness to ordinary experience.' Mr. Tillotson's expertise as a scholar and fine taste as a critic are patent throughout this book; his interest in philosophical problems is less apparent. His case for Thackeray's indecision as a moralist might have been strengthened if the basic evidence of it had been taken from the major novels and, surely, more credence should have been given to Thackeray's own belief that he had undergone a change of heart (a religious conversion?) about the time he was composing *Vanity Fair*.

Thackeray's Christianity and its relationship to any complete understanding of the nature of the commentary in his novels are inadequately discussed, despite the many references made to the attitude of 'religious people' towards Thackeray. Without some such serious consideration no valid riposte can be made to Saintsbury's claim—which is opposed to the judgement of Cardinal Newman quoted here from a private letter—that *Philip* is a major expression of Thackeray's art. Both the novelist and Lady Ritchie believed that this late novel contained the quintessence of his statement and feelings about the Christian way of life; read together with *A Shabby Genteel Story* it could support, though on other grounds, Mr. Tillotson's claim for the oneness in Thackeray's approach to the art of storytelling. Thus, as every important study should do, *Thackeray the Novelist* successfully establishes its claim that the novels should once more receive serious consideration and contrives to point the way that future studies must take. With becoming humility the author suggests that the views he has expressed 'are those of a timid pioneer'; with some profit he could have reserved the arguments marshalled in his provocative appendixes for a further consolidated advance.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

The Formation of the Phillipps Library up to the Year 1840. By A. N. L. MUNBY. Pp. xii + 177 (Phillipps Studies III). Cambridge: University Press, 1954. 18s. net.

In the first volume of Phillipps Studies Mr. Munby described the complexities of Sir Thomas Phillipps's privately printed catalogues of his collections, and in

his second volume (reviewed in *R.E.S.*, N.S., v (1954), 209-10) he gave us an account of the Baronet's life and family affairs; in this, the third volume, Mr. Munby addresses himself to the history of the library and its formation, taking the story up to the year 1840, by which time it is estimated that there were at Middle Hill 10,817 manuscripts and 5,557 printed books. In 1819, the date of the first of the printed catalogues of his collections, Philipps was twenty-seven and the number of volumes in his possession was 2,894, of which only fifty-four were manuscripts. The increase in the twenty-one years up to 1840 was therefore phenomenal. On the other hand, Philipps was fortunate in the period of his collecting. It was a time of falling prices, after the boom of the first decade, the heroic age, as it were, of Dibdin's epic, *The Bibliographical Decameron*, when the central dramatic event was the Roxburghe Sale; 'Malone told me', wrote Boswell to Richard Heber in 1804, 'some little time ago that the Duke of Roxburgh's library was certain to be sold and that absolute beggary would be the consequence to you, Lord Spencer and himself' (*The Heber Letters, 1783-1832*, ed. R. H. Cholmondeley (London, 1950), p. 195). And the falling prices operated equally on the Continent, of course, through the flooding of the market as a result of the Revolution of 1789 and the political troubles that followed. This background to Philipps's early efforts in collecting is vividly sketched in by Mr. Munby. Thus, for example, Philipps was able to buy no less than 146 medieval manuscripts from the Abbey of St. Martin at Tournai, as well as manuscripts from the religious houses at Ghislinghien, Aulne-sur-Sambre, and Cambron; at the great Meerman sale at The Hague in 1824 he bought 650 manuscripts. The opening words of his letter to his wife, 'The sale is over, & tomorrow the laborious operation of packing must begin', having the authentic ring of triumph; of course, this same letter has also a grumble that the manuscripts 'sold uncommonly dear' and gives as reason one characteristic of Philipps, 'owing to two or three villainous booksellers who came over from England'. He had more just reason for indulging his ill-humour against booksellers in the same year when he found himself in the Chardin sale in Paris up against 'the ring', the intricate activities of which are described in an interesting letter from Aillaud (the English booksellers' Paris agent) which Mr. Munby prints in full. Philipps's relations with the booksellers were, however, always stormy. If he had reason to complain of chicanery (as he sometimes did) or hard dealing, the treatment he himself meted out to the unfortunate booksellers was anything but admirable; for while he wanted and was determined to have the books he was equally determined only to pay when it suited him, and his lack of scruple and honour characterize alike his dealings with such a collector as Van Ess, the men he employed as printers at Middle Hill, and the waste-paper merchant James Graham. On the other hand, price difficulties were as time went on largely of his own making, for the rise in price of manuscript material was due almost certainly to his public reputation as an omnivorous buyer of manuscripts of every kind.

While a great deal of this side of Sir Thomas Philipps's activities makes distressing reading, Mr. Munby preserves here, as in his account of the Baronet's life in Philipps Studies II, a proper sense of balance, by illustrating throughout

his book the ways in which Phillipps showed his genuine concern that the records of the past should not only be preserved but cared for: thus, Phillipps championed the proper recording and treatment of the Parish Registers in vigorous letters to the Bishop of London and others, he was provoked (rightly) to great anger by a recommendation of the Buller Committee of 1836 that 'the [Record] Commission should be invested with the power of selecting from the great mass of Records such as are utterly valueless and destroying them' he was personally active in salvaging records when the Old Palace of Westminster was burnt down in 1834, himself rousing up Cooper, the Secretary of the Record Commission, from his bed in his house in St. John's Wood and taking him down to the scene; he visited libraries on the Continent and listed their medieval manuscripts, the results of one such tour being set down in a paper which he read to the Royal Society of Literature towards the end of 1830; and he printed at his own expense much historical and topographical material in addition to catalogues of manuscripts in public and private collections, among the latter those of Walter Sneyd and Robert Curzon. Quite the most pleasing chapter is indeed that devoted to Phillipps's friendship with the remarkable traveller and collector, Robert Curzon, who seems to have captivated Phillipps completely, and the debt we owe to Mr. Munby for his delightful retailing of this is further increased by his printing as Appendix B the 'Notes of Libraries in the Levant' which Curzon sent to Phillipps on 6 January 1837. Our delight in the *Visits to Monasteries in the Levant* (1849) is heightened by our knowledge that its author secured and was able to retain the friendship of one so irascible and so difficult to live with as Sir Thomas Phillipps. That Phillipps had friends is true, but the relations were often uneasy or accompanied by reservations; Sir Frederic Madden only maintained the friendship by assuming, as it appears now, a double aspect, one in his letters to the collector and one for the privacy of his diary, in which Phillipps is described at one point as 'that monopolising bug-bear' and at another as 'entitled . . . to a place in Bedlam'. Both aspects are most happily illustrated in Phillipps Studies III. I have already referred to Mr. Munby's second appendix; in his first, Appendix A, he has reprinted from Phillipps's Middle Hill Catalogue of 1837 the headings of the blocks of purchases, adding page references to Phillipps Studies and brief explanatory notes as appeared necessary. This is a very real service to bibliographers.

In Phillipps Studies III Mr. Munby has written a volume that is quite remarkable for the lucid, concise, and lively way in which the selection of a great mass of almost entirely new and often very complicated material has been presented, and the book has been delightfully enriched by the addition of a coloured frontispiece which reproduces a water-colour drawing of Sir Thomas Phillipps in 1834 made probably by Miss Birkenhead, the governess at Middle Hill.

C. E. WRIGHT

SHORT NOTICES

Some Types of Narrative in Chaucer's Poetry. By CLAES SCHAAR. Pp. 293 (Lund Studies in English 25). Lund: Gleerup; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954. Kr. 26.

Mr. Schaar examines three of Chaucer's methods of narration: that by which he summarizes a known story; that by which he relates a chain of events; that by which he relates a chain of events with incidental digressions. Mr. Schaar takes us first through all the instances of 'summarizing narrative' in Chaucer's poems; then he analyses the syntactical elements of the style of such narrative, then he discusses briefly how such material is treated in *Le Roman de la Rose*, Machaut, Froissart (the poems), Boccaccio (whether in Latin or Italian), Dante, Ovid, Virgil, Statius, the *fabliaux*, &c. He then proceeds in the same way with the other two methods of narration. He finds that when summarizing, Chaucer alternates between concrete and abstract passages in a way not to be closely paralleled in any predecessor or contemporary, and that in general Chaucer's technique of narrative, even in early poems, is independent of that in his source. The study is cautious and scholarly, and based on an immense amount of reading. There is an impressive knowledge of modern scholarship. So close and laborious a work cannot fail to reveal some points of Chaucer's narrative technique.

The interest, however, is in a single, narrow aspect of Chaucer's technique. This seems a small nut for such a ponderous hammer. Much of what is said is obvious and its significance small. We might have been spared so many examples, so much raw material, and been given, with far greater brevity, rather more definition, discrimination, and conclusions. I am not at all sure if discussion of Chaucer's narrative art without reference to the teaching of the rhetoricians is justifiable. The English is excellent, though the use of 'epical' meaning 'narrative' is unidiomatic.

D. S. BREWER

Poems of Ben Jonson. Edited by GEORGE BURKE JOHNSTON. Pp. liv+353. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954. 18s. net.

Professor Johnston has gathered in this volume of *The Muses' Library* all the *Epigrammes* of Ben Jonson, and all the poems in *The Forrest* and *The Underwood*. For these the basis of his text has been the 1616 and 1640 folios. There is a miscellaneous group, the sources of which he gives when they are not from the two folios, and most of which appear in the section 'Ungathered Verse' of the Herford and Simpson edition and in 'Driftwood' in the Newdigate edition. In addition, Professor Johnston has given us a few doubtful pieces and a selection of lyrics from the plays and masques. The *Art of Poetry* is omitted, but the only regrettable omissions are the lyric 'Slow, slow, fresh fount' (Echo's song from *Cynthia's Revells*, 1. ii) and 'Venus' Runaway' from the *Masque at Lord Haddington's Marriage*. Although textual and explanatory notes have been limited, the very full representation of Jonson's text in so compact a form makes this a useful volume, that should put Jonson more easily in the way of the ordinary reader.

Jonson, perhaps for want of such a handy volume, is regarded as for the scholar only. Today some of his epigrams, 'To Censorius Courtling', 'To Sir Lucklesse Woo-all', &c., are tedious, however he himself esteemed them. Epistles, addresses, and elegies, too, lose some of their point with the passage of time. Nevertheless, Jonson's are written by a poet of rich and severe self-knowledge, who does not expect for himself a better fate than he sees befall other men. In the lyrics, we suspect the rapture of one so unenchanted; we remember the freshness and gaiety of Herrick and the Cavaliers. Compared with the dashing Muses of Donne, Jonson's seem rather the dull girls he once himself accused

them of being. Yet in the end it is impossible not to like the average Jonsonian lyric so carefully wrought. Jonson did well by the English lyric, teaching the value of form, and the subtleties that can still go with clarity and simplicity and restraint. It is to be hoped that Professor Johnston's edition, by making him more accessible to the ordinary reader, will increase the number of his admirers.

HANNAH BUCHAN

The Happy Man. Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal 1600-1700. By MAREN-SOFIE RØSTVIG. Pp. 496 (Oslo Studies in English 2). Oslo: Akademisk Forlag; Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. 12s. 6d. net.

This book is a valuable discussion of the classical motif of the *beatus vir* and its popularity with seventeenth-century English poets. The historical and philosophical background is thoroughly analysed: the desire, common among the defeated royalists, for retirement; the habit of religious contemplation; the association of solitude and the appreciation of nature; the pervasive idea of the golden age: and the interpretation, recently discussed by Professor Wallerstein, of nature as a divine hieroglyph. Dr. Røstvig describes the mutation of the theme of the *beatus vir* in four main phases: (i) a simple adaption of the classical ideal of 'the happy husbandman'; (ii) the mid-century emphasis on solitary meditation, symbolized in the figure of 'the serene contemplator'; (iii) Royalist interest in what Evelyn calls 'a society of the *paradisi cultores*, persons of antient simplicity, Paradisean and Hortulan saints'; and (iv) the ousting of 'the hortulan saint' after the Restoration by 'the innocent epicurean' seeking privacy and ease in the country.

Incidental topics of interest to students of seventeenth-century poetry are the common concern of Fane, Fairfax, Benlowes, and Marvell—in some sense a literary circle—with the theme of rural retirement, and the influence of Sarbiewski's Horatian odes (translated into English in 1646) on Benlowes and others. Dr. Røstvig adds a substantial supplement to Professor Jenkins's recent study.

In its multiplicity of instances and its excessive detail, this book shows the familiar weakness of doctoral dissertations. Indeed, although Dr. Røstvig is to be commended for her cultivation of a large new field of study, she would have been better advised to publish her findings in a series of concentrated articles. At least one admiring but exhausted reader hopes that she will handle the eighteenth-century *beatus vir* with greater dispatch.

JAMES KINSLEY

Aestheticism and Oscar Wilde. By AATOS OJALA. Part I: Life and Letters. Pp. 231 (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 90, 2). Helsinki, 1954. 800 mk.

In view of the extant criticism on Wilde, Dr. Ojala's study reveals hardly any new aspect. Scholarly research into late nineteenth-century English aestheticism has always been conspicuous for its purely descriptive character, and Dr. Ojala pursues his subject along the trodden path. The greater part of his dissertation, therefore, is taken up by a juxtaposition of parallel passages of Wilde and his contemporaries, in order to prove the aesthete's ever-ready response to all kinds of influences. The presentation of the material is purely factual, only occasional points are elaborated, and evaluation is hardly ever attempted. When an interpretation, however, is unavoidable the author frequently resorts to quoting that of other critics, especially R. Merle.

This positivistic outline is thrown into relief by a rather lofty introduction which alternates between sweeping statements and truisms. This is due largely to the wide range of subjects touched upon in a few pages. Life is defined in a subordinate clause, and the results of psychosomatic medicine are quoted to corroborate the view that body and soul

form a unity. As regards the fundamentals of aestheticism the discussion is based on notions advanced by popular German psychologists. But was it not Kierkegaard who illuminated the problem of aestheticism once and for all? His name, however, is conspicuously absent. The confusing element which the introduction contains results from a mistranslation of the term 'Wertsetzung' which has been rendered by 'the sociologically conditioned value assessment' and is sometimes simply referred to as 'value assessment'. It should read 'value postulation'.

Apart from this misnomer the occurrence of Germanisms is frequent, and this leads to rather mixed and nonsensical metaphors: e.g. 'when the Technique has solved the problem of Labour' (123); Wilde's art 'was incapable of leaving the mother-body of its creator' (130); 'Charmides was born almost exclusively under the auspices of Keats' (166); 'Wilde's idealism shows itself in these tales so chemically pure from alien elements' (172). The main flaw in the language lies in the indiscriminate use of colloquialisms and literary phrases. The following misprints may be noted: 'Irwing Babbit' (26), 'man-slaughters' (98), 'centreing' (179), 'intravert' (184), 'tributories' (216).

Within its limitations this is an acceptable piece of work for the uninitiated reader. It might also prove useful for reference, for all the facts pertaining to Wilde's personality and outlook are conveniently arranged. In any case the final verdict must be reserved pending the publication of the sequel.

W. ISER

A History of Italian Literature. By ERNEST HATCH WILKINS. Pp. 523.
London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. 45s. net.

In this book the doyen of Italian studies in America describes the literature of Italy from Saint Francis to Croce. 'Describes' is purposely said, as the book contains little criticism, which, indeed, would be outside its scope, and little expression of personal preferences, unless the remarkable fact that Campanella is allotted almost as much space as Ariosto be taken as such. It is, on the other hand, replete with facts and is likely to prove the most useful book of its type written in English: being a work of reference, it tells the reader rather what Italian literature is about than what Italian literature is like. Naïveté is sometimes apparent—'an unfortunate friendship led him [Campanella] to a lasting belief in astrology'—and the accounts of the Italian classics are sometimes reminiscent of the synopses of previous chapters in magazines—'Lucia has attracted the capricious attention of Don Rodrigo, a lawless local grandee, who is determined to get her into his power'—but Professor Wilkins is always as readable as he is informative. The book appears to be intended for those who do not read Italian and the majority of poetic quotations are, very regrettably, given in translation. More astonishingly still the bibliography is confined to works in English or translated into English and, owing to the random nature of Anglo-Saxon Italian studies, is a very hodge-podge affair, four chapters of the book not being represented in it at all. It would have been desirable to include at least the basic essentials of an Italian bibliography, for example *La Storia Letteraria d'Italia*. A virtue of the book is that it gives short parallel accounts of history and the fine arts and, for students of comparative literature, there are valuable and detailed references to Italian influences on other literatures. There are omissions: it is hard, for example, to see why the diarist of The Thousand, G. C. Abba, is not mentioned, while the creator of Pinocchio receives a paragraph; Algarotti and Cesarotti have surely too important a place in the history of Illuminism to be relegated to a 'list of additional writers'; while (more seriously) there is no mention at all of Federigo della Valle, rediscovered by Croce, considered by Momigliano to be the most significant poet of the Seicento, and the writer of four remarkable dramas, one of which, *La Reina di Scozia*, is the first appearance of Mary Stuart in literature. Nevertheless, this is a good book, one that is consistently enjoyable and interesting, and which shows good taste and discrimination in selecting passages for quotation.

M. F. M. MEIKLEJOHN

Collected Papers. By R. W. ZANDVOORT. Pp. viii+186 (Groningen Studies in English 5). Groningen: Wolters, 1954. Fl. 7.90.

This book consists of a selection of notes and articles originally published in *English Studies* and other journals; if there is thus nothing new in it, there is much that is of interest and value, while the collection in convenient form of the results of such widely diversified scholarship makes an impressive monument to the industry of the author.

The eighteen articles range in date from 1917 to 1953, and in subject from the *Leiden Riddle* and King Alfred's *Boethius* to various syntactic features of present-day English. Four are concerned with early English drama (including a lecture on *Everyman*, in which the priority of the Dutch *Elckerlijc* is fairly argued) and three with Shakespeare. Many will find the article on the *Leiden Riddle* the most interesting part of the book; this consists of some general remarks on the literary riddle in Old English, followed by a discussion of the mail-coat riddle in the Exeter Book (with its crux *þurh þreata geþracu*), then an account of the Leiden text with photographs of the manuscript, and a brief history of the modern editions. Finally there are a few comments on A. H. Smith's edition, based mainly on Zandvoort's own inspection of the manuscript. It is pointed out that Smith's reading *uulgo* in the last line but one of Aldhelm's *Lorica-riddle* is a mistake for *uulgi*, while *ne* should be read for *ni* in l. 8 of the Leiden text. Doubt is cast on Smith's suggestion that the translation was in conception a literary exercise.

The greater part of the book is devoted to nine articles dealing with the syntax and grammar of Modern (i.e. 'Current') English; and it is here that we see most clearly the distinctive contribution of Zandvoort and his compatriots to the study of English. He defines his general position in two items ('Progress in Syntax' and 'A Critique of Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*') in which he pleads for the purely synchronic approach to descriptive grammar and for its recognition as a fit subject for academic study. Zandvoort aligns himself with Kruisinga, whose practice, especially in the fifth edition of his *Handbook of Present-day English*, is shown to be close to the principles enunciated by de Saussure. Jespersen, therefore, comes in for some criticism, mainly on the ground that his method rests on a compromise between the 'historical method of the 19th century and the a-historical, synchronic and structural method of the 20th'. The other articles in this group deal mostly with special features of Current English syntax ('The Perfect of Experience', 'Two Collective Functions of the Nominal *s*-Suffix', &c.); and the book concludes with a list of the author's other writings.

JAMES M. URE

De Descriptio Temporum. By C. S. LEWIS. Pp. 23. Cambridge: University Press, 1955. 2s. 6d. net.

Professor C. S. Lewis's inaugural lecture from the new chair of Medieval and Renaissance English Literature at Cambridge is concerned with the fixing of historical periods, or more strictly, with inquiring at what point to place the Great Divide between Old and New Western Culture. The traditional place was at the Renaissance; but that place is less acceptable today than it was thirty years ago, as the title of the new Cambridge chair, with its indication of continuity, bears witness. Mr. Lewis reviews in turn the divisions between Antiquity and the Dark Ages, between the Dark and the Middle Ages, and at the end of the seventeenth century; but none he finds so great as 'that which divides the present from, say, the age of Jane Austen and Scott'. Somewhere between us and Scott lies a change in the principles of government, a change in art and poetry manifest in the bewildering difficulties of the new styles, a religious change no less than the unchristening of Europe, and a change in Man's place in nature owing to the birth of the machines.

That these are important changes few would deny and many would accept with perhaps an adjustment in emphasis here and there, occasioned by a doubt whether the present age is so wholly unchristian as Professor Lewis declares or whether the political change is so peculiar. Two reservations remain. One is a question of 'period'. Mr. Lewis draws his line 'somewhere between us and the Waverley Novels, somewhere between us and

Persuasion'; but though he seems reluctant to be more specific, it is noticeable that he takes his examples of change from our own times. The greater part of the nineteenth century is thus left as a cultural no-man's-land to be occupied, it might seem, by his colleague the King Edward VII Professor advancing from his territory in that monarch's reign. In an earlier part of his lecture Mr. Lewis admits that 'in the reality studied, there is no Great Divide', but that periods are forced upon us in arranging a term's work or in drawing up a lecture list. If they are no more than that, if the divisions are a matter of mere practical convenience, we can scarcely regard with equanimity an arrangement which encourages the neglect of so important a part of our literature as the Victorian age. Is the nineteenth century to suffer what was often the fate of the fifteenth?

But is the division merely practical? Before the lecture is over, it begins to look more important. With a final flourish Mr. Lewis claims that he (and a few others) are survivors of the Old Western order and are thus peculiarly well placed to interpret it to New Western undergraduates, that he stands somewhat like an ancient Athenian recalled to talk about Greek drama. If he intended his words to be taken seriously, one can only say that his claim is at odds with his past achievements. A critic who belonged so completely to a former era could not speak so directly to us as he has done: he would require an interpreter just as the criticism of Aristotle and Longinus requires interpretation. I am afraid it must be admitted that the very measure of his success in interpreting Chaucer, Spenser, and Milton for us shows that he is firmly placed on our side of the Great Divide, however wistful the glances he may cast across it.

JOHN BUTT

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xvii, No. 1, December 1955
Art and the concept of will (Clifford Leech), 1-7.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxvi, No. 6, December 1955
The authorship and political meaning of *Cambises* (William A. Armstrong), 289-99.
'Rivos cruoris torridi' in Charms to staunch bleeding (Leonard Forster), 308-9.
M.E. 'wery forwandred': a rejoinder (M. L. Samuels), 310-13.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. vi, No. 1, January 1956
Criticism today: a report from America (W. K. Wimsatt, Jr.), 1-21.
The psychology of tragic pleasure (Roy Morrell), 22-37.
The prisoner of *The Prisoner of Zenda* (S. Gorley Putt), 38-59.

Literature and/or belief: a progress report (D. J. Enright), 60-69.

A negative note on Bergson and Virginia Woolf (J. W. Graham), 70-74.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

VIII^e Année, No. 4, octobre-décembre 1955

Charles Williams and romantic experience (R. T. Davies), 289-98.
Aspects biographiques de l'œuvre de W. Somerset Maugham; l'enfance (J. Dobrinsky), 299-312.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

Vol. liv, No. 3, July 1955
The independence of Pope as a political satirist (Hugo M. Reichard), 309-17.
Pearl and a lost tradition (John Conley), 332-47.
Browning's 'Popularity' and the

spasmodic poets (Jerome Thale), 348-54.
Form in *Richard II*, II. i. 40-66 (William C. McAvoy), 355-61.
Peacock's use of music in his novels (Paulina June Salz), 370-9.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxiv, No. 2, 1955

The Latin text of Purvey's psalter (Henry Hargreaves), 73-90.
Manuscript fragments of English sermons attributed to John Wyclif (M. B. Parkes), 97-100.
An echo of *Beowulf* in Athelstan's charters of 931-933 A.D.? (R. L. Reynolds), 101-3.

MODERN FICTION STUDIES

Vol. i, No. 4, November 1955

Gatsby and the hole in time (R. W. Stallman), 2-16.
E. M. Forster's dialectic: *Howards End* (Alice R. Bensen), 17-22.
The Rainbow: the shaping of modern man (Seymour Lainoff), 23-27.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxx, No. 7, November 1955

On dating a Middle English moral poem (Russell Hope Robbins), 473-6.
Tristram's first interviews with Mark in Malory's *Morte Darthur* (R. M. Lumiansky), 476-8.
The tempestatis praesagia in Chapman's *Eugenia* (S. K. Heninger, Jr.), 478-84.
'Sublime' as applied to Nature (Frederick Staver), 484-7.
Resolution and Independence Stanza XVIII (Florence G. Marsh), 488-90.

Vol. lxx, No. 8, December 1955

Word-play in *Pearl*, 277-278 (Henry R. Rupp), 558-9.
The magic of *In Principio* (Morton W. Bloomfield), 559-65.
[Chaucer's friar.]

A lost play of Perkin Warbeck (John J. O'Connor), 566-8.

Webster's borrowings from Whetstone (Robert W. Dent), 568-70.

Tourneur's *Atheist's Tragedy* and the jig of 'Singing Simpkin' (Jackson I. Cope), 571-3.

The unclean meats of the Mosaic law and the banquet scene in *Paradise Regained* (Michael Fixler), 573-7.

Several words first employed in D'Urfe's *The Richmond Heiress* (Raymond A. Biswanger, Jr.), 577-8.
Sarah Scott's *Agreeable Ugliness*, a translation (Gaby E. Onderwyzer), 578+80.

Arnold's Oxford lectures on poetry (R. H. Super), 581-4.

Yeats's 'Sailing to Byzantium' (Harry Modean Campbell), 585-9.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xvi, No. 4, December 1955

Stod on stapole (Arthur E. DuBois), 291-8: addendum (D. D. Griffith), 298-9.
The nature of Spenser's imagery (Lyle Grazier), 300-10.
Restoration of 'The Happy Warrior' (John Bowen Hamilton), 311-24.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. li, No. 1, January 1956

The seventh sphere: a note on 'Troilus and Criseyde' (Forrest S. Scott), 2-5.

Dr. Faustus and Renaissance learning (Joseph T. McCullen), 6-16.

A note on 'Beowulf' l. 1828 B (A. Murray Kinloch), 71.

An addition to the canon of Bacon's writings (Corinne Rickert), 71-72.

'Macbeth' IV, iii, 107 (J. C. Maxwell), 73.

Lord Bute, John Home and Ossian: two letters (R. George Thomas), 73-75.

Keats and Akenside: a borrowing in

the 'Ode to a Nightingale' (Arthur Pollard), 75-77.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. liii, No. 2, November 1955

The role of the narrator in *Pearl* (Charles Moorman), 73-81.

Shakespeare and Jonson: some unreported seventeenth-century allusions (Ernest Sirluck), 88-99.

The social milieu of early-eighteenth-century comedy (John Loftis), 100-12.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

39ste Jaarg., Afl. 4, 1 October 1955

Celtic influence in English (Gerard J. Visser), 276-93.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Vol. x, No. 3, December 1955

Blackmore's novels before *Lorna Doone* (William E. Buckler), 169-87.

Dickens and the brick-and-mortar sects (Arthur H. Adrian), 188-201.

A note on Thackeray's *Amelia* (Mark Spilka), 202-10.

A suggestion for the original of Thackeray's Rawdon Crawley (Arthur Sherbo), 211-16.

Independence vs. Isolation: Hawthorne and James on the problem of the artist (Annette K. Baxter), 225-31.

A human failing in *Pride and Prejudice*? (Edd Winfield Parks), 237-40.

Sir Walter Scott and Restoration 'préciosité' (David S. Berkeley), 240-2.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. ii, N.S., No. 11, November 1955

Notes on 'The King of Tars' (A. J. Bliss), 461-2.

The word 'Goths' in 'A Knack to Know a Knave' (Paul E. Bennett), 462-3.

Classical histories and Elizabethan soldiers (Henry J. Webb), 466-9.

Henry Cary (1625-1655) (Elsie Duncan-Jones), 469-71.

An unrecorded reference in a poem by Donne (Max Novak), 471-2.

Bacon and Shakespeare on companionship in misfortune (R. L. Eagle), 472-3.

'King Richard II'. The 'deposition' scene in Q4 (K. B. Danks), 473-4.

'King John', V. ii. 103-4 (Ernest Schanzer), 474-5.

'Romeo and Juliet', II. i. 38 (S. G. Culliford), 475.

The 'mousetrap' play in 'Hamlet' (Sara Ruth Watson), 477-8.

'Othello' and Conrad's 'Chance' (William B. Bache), 478-9.

Shakespeare a researcher? (C. A. Greer), 479-80.

Some notes on the vocabulary of John Marston—VII (Gustav Cross), 480-2.

[See *N. & Q.*, ii. 427-8.]

More 'Georgics' echoes in 'Cyder' (John M. Aden), 484-5.

Welsted's lines to the Duke of Buckingham (Aubrey Williams), 485-6.

Mrs. Piozzi and the metres of Boethius (J. Gilmour), 488.

Two Wordsworth letters (David Bonnell Green), 489-90.

Southey, and Wordsworth's 'The Idiot Boy' (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), 490-1.

John Payne Collier and the Stationers' Registers (Sydney Race), 492-5.

The piracy of 'Great Expectations' (K. J. Fielding), 495-6.

Vol. ii, N.S., No. 12, December 1955

Lucretius and Bacon on death (D. S. Brewer), 509-10.

Barnfield's borrowings from Spenser (Waldo F. McNeir), 510-11.

Buchanan, Leslie and 'Macbeth' (Kenneth Muir), 511-12.

'They say the owle was a baker's daughter' (*Hamlet*, iv. v. 40) (J. Copley), 512-13.

'That two-handed engine at the door' (H. Mutschmann), 515.

The Jubilee of 1700 and Farquhar's 'The Constant Couple' (Richard Morton and William M. Peterson), 521-5.

A prologue by John Dennis (A. N. Wilkins), 525-6.

Swift's 'Corinna' (John R. Elwood), 529-30.

An anonymous attack on Swift (Robert A. Day), 530-2.

Further attacks on the 'Critical Review' (Robert Donald Spector), 535.

The testament dative of Robert Blair (Thomas Rogers), 535-7.

[Continued *ibid.*, iii. 35-38.]

Dr. Johnson's $\Theta \Phi$ (E. S. de Beer), 537-8.

Mary Coleridge and Adolf Ribbing (Frederic Fleisher), 538-40.

What happened at Tanyrallt (H. M. Dowling), 540-2.

[To Shelley.]

Letters to Samuel Rogers from Tom Moore and Sydney Smith (David Bonnell Green), 542-3.

A 'new' version of Arnold's essay on Wordsworth (S. O. A. Ullmann), 543-4.

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 1, January 1956

Mundy's birthdate (I. A. Shapiro), 2-3.

The ballad sources of Peele's 'Edward I' (Frank S. Hook), 3-5.

Storm imagery in 'Appius and Virginia' (Inga-Stina Ekeblad), 5-7.

Sackville's sonnets (Allan H. Orrick), 7-9.

Richard Crashaw and the Little Gidding bookbinders (George Walton Williams), 9-10.

'Pericles' and 'Jonah' (Norman Nathan), 10-11.

Cordelia as 'last and least' of Lear's daughters (T. W. Craik), 11.

What Heminges and Condell really meant (K. B. Danks), 11-13.

Webster and Nashe (Sidney Thomas), 13.

Sir Thomas Urquhart's rimed moral discourse (Kelsie B. Harder), 13-17.

Prior and Gildon (H. Bunker Wright), 18-20.

Dryden's translation of Chaucer (R. D. Spector), 23-26.

Uncle Toby's 'campaigns' and raree-shows (J. M. Stedmond), 28-29.

Gray and Green (R. G. Howarth), 29-30.

Censorship as a controlling theme in 'Pamela' and 'Clarissa' (R. Baird Shuman), 30-32.

The background of Coleridge's 'Cain' (Werner W. Beyer), 32-34.

The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, line 142 (J. Edwin Whitesell), 34-35.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxiv, No. 3, July 1955

A belated Augustan: Bonnell Thornton, Esq. (Wallace Cable Brown), 335-48.

The 109th and 110th sonnets of *Astrophel and Stella* (Karl M. Murphy), 349-52.

Vol. xxxiv, No. 4, October 1955

The year of Emerson's poetic maturity (Carl F. Strauch), 353-77.

Thomas Taylor and Blake's drama of Persephone (George Mills Harper), 378-94.

Mr. Eliot's Agon (Sears Jayne), 395-414.

Notes on some poems attributed to William Strode (C. F. Main), 444-8.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxx, No. 5, December 1955

Structure, symbol, and theme in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (Glen O. Allen), 934-54.

An analysis of *The Windhover* (Archibald A. Hill), 968-78.

George Eliot, George Henry Lewes, and the novel (Alice R. Kaminsky), 997-1013.

222 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Newman and the Oriel fellowship (Martin J. Svaglic), 1014-32.
 On liberty in the poetry of Wordsworth (Carl R. Woodring), 1033-48.
 The relation of Johnson's *Rasselas* to Lobo's *Voyage to Abyssinia* (Ellen Douglass Leyburn), 1059-67.
 Comenius and the real character in England (Benjamin DeMott), 1068-81.
 The voice of the Redeemer in *Paradise Lost* (Joseph H. Summers), 1082-9.
 Milton's annotations of Aratus (Maurice Kelley and Samuel D. Atkins), 1090-1106.
 King Hamlet's ambiguous ghost (Robert H. West), 1107-17.
 The meaning of *eorlsceipe* in *Beowulf* (Raymond Carter Sutherland), 1133-42.
 Augustine, *Ayenbite*, and *Ulysses* (J. Mitchell Morse), 1143-59.
 Point of view in fiction (Norman Friedman), 1160-84.
 The fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost* (Wayne Shumaker and Millicent Bell), 1185-1203.

Johnson, Percy, and Warton (E. L. McAdam, Jr.), 1203-4.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxiii, No. 4, *Autumn 1955*

The poet as witness (Charles T. Harrison), 539-50.

The limits of Joyce's naturalism (Richard Ellmann), 567-75.

Vol. lxiv, No. 1, *Winter 1956*

Wordsworth, the public, and the people (Patrick Cruttwell), 71-80.

Approach to *Othello* (Robert B. Heilman), 98-116.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lii, No. 4, *October 1955*

Shakespeare history plays and Daniel: an assessment (Laurence Michel and Cecil C. Seronsy), 549-77.

Notes on Robert Burton and John Milton (William J. Grace), 578-91.

Rant, cant, and tone on the Restoration stage (John Harold Wilson), 592-8.

Robinson Crusoe and the Cyclops (Allan H. MacLaine), 599-604.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

June-December, 1955

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1955 the date of each publication.]

AUSTEN, J. *Letters 1796-1817*, ed. R. W. Chapman. pp. x+226. 5s.

BATE, W. J. *The Achievement of Samuel Johnson*. New York; London, 1956. pp. xii+248. 27s. 6d.

BAUDELAIRE, C. *The Flowers of Evil*, ed. M. and J. Mathews. pp. xxvi+450. 35s.

BOWERS, F. *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists*. Philadelphia; London. pp. x+131. 21s.

BOYCE, B. *The Polemic Character 1640-1661*. Lincoln, Nebraska. pp. xiv+160. \$2.75.

BRÉE, G. *Marcel Proust and Deliverance from Time*, tr. C. J. Richards and A. D. Truitt. New Brunswick. pp. viii+248. \$4.50.

BRINKLEY, R. F. (ed.) *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*. Durham, North Carolina; London. pp. xxxviii+704. 94s.

BROWNE, T. *Religio Medici*, ed. J.-J. Denonain. Cambridge. pp. xxii+102. 8s. 6d.

BUTT, J. *Pope's Poetical Manuscripts*. Proc. Brit. Acad. xl, pp. 23-39. 5s.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

223

- CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY. Lectures on some modern poets by members of the Department of English. Pittsburgh. pp. x+90. \$1.00.
- CARRINGTON, C. Rudyard Kipling. His life and work. pp. xxiv+549. 25s.
- CAZAMIAN, L. A History of French Literature. Oxford. pp. xiv+464. 30s.
- CECIL, Lord D. Walter Pater. Cambridge. pp. 30. 2s. 6d.
- CHANG, H. C. Allegory and Courtesy in Spenser. Edinburgh. pp. x+227. 18s.
- CHAPIN, C. F. Personification in Eighteenth-Century English Poetry. New York; London. pp. x+175. 24s.
- CHINOL, E. P. B. Shelley. Napoli. pp. 389. L. 2,000.
- CLUNES, A. British Theatre History. (N.B.L. Readers' Guide) Cambridge. pp. 27. 2s. 6d.
- CRAIG, H. English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages. Oxford. pp. viii+421. 42s.
- DANIELSSON, B. John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation. Part I. Stockholm. pp. 338. Kr. 38.
- DAVIE, D. Articulate Energy. An enquiry into the syntax of English Poetry. pp. viii+173. 18s.
- DAVIS, N. The Language of the Pastons. Proc. Brit. Acad. xl, pp. 119-144. 4s.
- DEKKER, T. The Dramatic Works, ed. F. Bowers. Vol. II. Cambridge. pp. viii+592. 40s.
- DICTIONARY OF THE OLDER SCOTTISH TONGUE, ed. Sir W. A. Craigie. Part XVI. Chicago; London. pp. 241-360. 50s.
- DONNE, J. Sermons, Vol. II, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson. Berkeley; London. pp. xii+466. 56s. 6d.
- EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. The Life of St. George, by Alexander Barclay, ed. W. Nelson. pp. xxvi+120. 28s.
- Deonise hid Diuinite, and other treatises on contemplative prayer, ed. P. Hodgson. pp. lx+158. 30s.
- EVELYN, J. Diary, ed. E. S. de Beer. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. xiv+171; Vol. II, pp. viii+579; Vol. III, pp. x+639; Vol. IV, pp. x+654; Vol. V, pp. viii+623; Vol. VI, pp. viii+630. £15. 15s.
- FRANK, J. The Levellers. A History of the Writings of Three Seventeenth-Century Social Democrats, J. Lilburne, R. Overton, W. Walwyn. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. x+345. 40s.
- FREEMAN, M. D. H. Lawrence. Gainesville. pp. viii+277. \$5.
- FROST, W. Dryden and the Art of Translation. New Haven; London. pp. xii+100. 28s.
- GRIFFITH, D. D. Bibliography of Chaucer 1908-1953. Seattle. pp. 18+398. \$5.
- HALLER, W. Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. New York; London. pp. xvi+410. 48s.
- HOGARTH, W. The Analysis of Beauty, ed. J. Burke. Oxford. pp. lxii+9 plates+244. 42s.
- HORSMAN, E. A., and BENSON, L. R. (eds.). The Canadian Journal of Alfred Domett 1833-1835. London, Ontario; Durham. pp. xii+66. 5s.
- JULIANA. Ed. R. Woolf. pp. x+90. 8s. 6d.
- KAHN, A. M. C. (ed.). Library Resources in the Greater London Area. No. 4. Theatre Collections. pp. 29. 4s. 6d.
- KER, W. P. The Dark Ages. Edinburgh. pp. xviii+361. 15s.
- On Modern Literature, ed. T. Spencer and J. Sutherland. Oxford. pp. xviii+282. 35s.
- LAQUEUR, R. Shakespeares dramatische Konzeption. Tübingen. pp. viii+356. DM. 22.
- LE CLAIR, R. C. Young Henry James 1843-1870. New York. pp. 469. \$6.50.
- LONG, J. H. Shakespeare's Use of Music. Gainesville. pp. xvi+213. \$4.75.
- MAISACK, H. William Langlands Verhältnis zum Zisterziensischen Mönchtum. Balingen, 1953. pp. 142. No price given.
- MARLOWE, C. Edward II, ed. H. B. Charlton and R. D. Waller [2nd ed. rev. F. N. Lees.] pp. x+244. 18s.
- MEYERHOFF, H. Time in Literature. Berkeley; London. pp. xiv+160. 26s.
- MICHIGAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, ARTS AND LETTERS, Papers Vol. XL. Ann Arbor; London. pp. viii+336. \$10; 80s.
- MILTON, J. Poetical Works, ed. H. Darbishire. Vol. II. Oxford. pp. xx+375. 35s.
- MÜLLER-SCHWEFE, G. Das persönliche Menschenbild Matthew Arnolds in der dichterischen Gestaltung. Tübingen. pp. 292. DM. 31.
- NICOLL, A. A History of English Drama 1660-1900. Vol. IV. Early Nineteenth Century Drama. Cambridge. pp. x+668. 55s.

- OHLANDER, U. (ed.). *A Middle English Metrical Paraphrase of the Old Testament II*. Stockholm. pp. 112. Kr. 12.
- OLIVER, H. J. *The Problem of John Ford*. Melbourne; Cambridge. pp. viii+146. 25s.
- OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE, THE. Tr. into verse by G. Eggers. Durham, North Carolina; London. pp. xviii+62. 22s. 6d.
- PARRY, T. *A History of Welsh Literature*, tr. H. Idris Bell. Oxford. pp. xii+534. 50s.
- PARTRIDGE, E. *Shakespeare's Bawdy*. [2nd edn.] pp. x+226. 21s.
- QUIRK, R., and C. L. WRENN. *An Old English Grammar*. pp. x+166. 9s. 6d.
- RAY, G. N. *Thackeray. The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846*. pp. xvi+538. 35s.
- REID, A. S. *The Yellow Ruff and the Scarlet Letter. A source of Hawthorne's novel*. Gainesville. pp. viii+150. \$3.75.
- RICHARDS, I. A. *Speculative Instruments*. pp. xii+216. 21s.
- ROGERS, R. W. *The Major Satires of Alexander Pope*. Urbana. pp. xii+163. \$3.
- ROSENBERRY, E. H. *Melville and the Comic Spirit*. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. x+211. 32s.
- ROSENFELD, S. *Foreign Theatrical Companies in Gt. Britain in the 17th and 18th Centuries*. (Soc. for Theatre Research.) pp. vi+42.
- SALTER, F. M. *Medieval Drama in Chester*. Toronto; London, 1956. pp. xii+138. 36s.
- SCHOENBAUM, S. *Middleton's Tragedies*. New York; London. pp. xii+275. \$4.50; 36s.
- SCHULTZ, H. *Milton and Forbidden Knowledge*. New York; London, 1956. pp. viii+309. 40s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Julius Caesar*, ed. T. S. Dorsch (Arden edn.). pp. lxxiv+166. 15s.
- STANZEL, F. *Die typischen Erzählsituationen im Roman. Dargestellt an Tom Jones, Moby-Dick, The Ambassadors, Ulysses, u.a.* Wien. pp. viii+176. \$4.70.
- STUDIES IN COMMUNICATION, Contributed to Communications Research Centre, University College, London. pp. viii+182. 21s.
- TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH. Vol. V. New Orleans. pp. 182. \$2.
- WAGGONER, H. H. *Hawthorne*. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. x+268. \$4.75; 38s.
- WAIN, J. (ed.). *Interpretations. Essays on Twelve English Poems*. pp. xvi+237. 25s.
- WALTON, J. K. *The Copy for the Folio Text of Richard III. With a Note on the Copy for the Folio Text of King Lear*. Auckland. pp. 164. 15s.
- WATKINS, W. B. C. *An Anatomy of Milton's Verse*. Baton Rouge. pp. xii+151. \$3.
- WELLS, H. W. *Poet and Psychiatrist. A critical portrait of Merrill Moore, M.D.* New York. pp. x+325. \$5.
- WEST, R. H. *Milton and the Angels*. Athens, Georgia. pp. x+237. \$4.50.
- WHITMAN, W. *Manuscripts. Leaves of Grass 1860*, ed. F. Bowers. Chicago; London. pp. lxxiv+264. 94s.
- WILLCOCK, G. D. *Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays*. Proc. Brit. Acad. XL, pp. 103-17. 3s. 6d.
- WILLIAMS, A. L. *Pope's Dunciad*. pp. x+162. 18s.
- WILLIAMS, S. T. *The Spanish Background of American Literature*. New Haven; London. Vol. I, pp. xxviii+433; Vol. II, pp. viii+441. \$10; 80s.
- WIMSATT, Jr., W. K. (ed.) *English Stage Comedy*. New York; London. pp. x+182. 28s.
- YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XXXIV, 1953. Ed. F. S. Boas and B. White. pp. 337. 25s.